DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 305 SO 006 729

AUTHOR	Hales, E. E. Y.
TITLE	European Curriculum Studies. Number 8: History.
INSTITUTION	Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Manhattan Publishing Company, 225 Lafayette Street, New York, New York 10012 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Bias; Course Content; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Problems; *Curriculum Research; Developed Nations; Educational Policy; *Educational Status Comparison; Educational Trends; *History; *History Instruction; Interdisciplinary Approach; International Organizations; Modern History; National Programs; Secondary Education; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe; Local History

ABSTRACT

The Committee for General and Technical Education of the Council of Europe has initiated several projects to study, compare and evaluate curriculum materials used in the member nations. The study highlights preoccupations of educators in member countries responsible for the planning of history programs. There is concern for the content of the history course: the extent to which it should be nationally or internationally-oriented; the length to which local history should be treated; and whether the emphasis should be placed, in secondary education, on contemporary history. At the same time, the problem of teaching method remains the avoidance of prejudice, propaganda and error. Reflecting the vogue of interdisciplinarity, the study considers the relationship of history to other subjects in the curriculum and which elements of history might be integrated into hybrid disciplines such as social studies. The concluding chapter is on the training of history teachers. Related documents are ED 070 652 and SO 006 728. (Author/KSM)

ED 085305

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Europe
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Council of Europe

COUNCIL
FOR
CULTURAL
CO-OPERATION

Acc 727

EUROPEAN CURRICULUM STUDIES

No 8 : HISTORY

1973

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085305

EUROPEAN CURRICULUM STUDIES

(in the Academic Secondary School)

N° 8 - HISTORY

by

E. E. Y HALES

Council for Cultural Co-operation
Council of Europe
Strasbourg
1973

$2.00

The Council for Cultural Co-operation was set up by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 1 January 1962 to draw up proposals for the cultural policy of the Council of Europe, to co-ordinate and give effect to the overall cultural programme of the organisation and to allocate the resources of the Cultural Fund. It is assisted by three permanent committees of senior officials : for higher education and research, for general and technical education and for out-of-school education. All the member governments of the Council of Europe, together with Greece, Finland, Spain and the Holy See are represented on these bodies[1].

In educational matters, the aim of the Council for Cultural Co-operation (C.C.C.) is to help to create conditions in which the right educational opportunities are available to young Europeans whatever their background or level of academic accomplishment, and to facilitate their adjustment to changing political and social conditions. This entails in particular a greater rationalisation of the complex educational process. Attention is paid to all influences bearing on the acquisition of knowledge, from home television to advanced research ; from the organisation of youth centres to the improvement of teacher training. The countries concerned will thereby be able to benefit from the experience of their neighbours in the planning and reform of structures, curricula and methods in all branches of education.

Since 1963 the C.C.C. has been publishing, in English and French, a series of works of general interest entitled "Education in Europe", which records the results of expert studies and intergovernmental investigations conducted within the framework of its programme. A list of these publications will be found at the end of the volume.

Some of the volumes in this series have been published in French by Armand Colin of Paris and in English by Harraps of London.

These works are being supplemented by a series of "companion volumes" of a more specialised nature to which the present study belongs.

General Editor :

The Director of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs, Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France)

The opinions expressed in these studies are not to be regarded as reflecting the policy of individual governments or of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

Applications for reproduction and translation should be addressed to the General Editor.

---

1. For complete list, see back of cover.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		3
CHAPTER I	Author's note on Sources for this study	5
CHAPTER II	The Uncertain Status and Prospects of History in Secondary Schools today	7
CHAPTER III	The History Syllabus today	11
CHAPTER IV	Methods and Approaches	17
CHAPTER V	The relation of History to other Subjects	25
CHAPTER VI	Prejudice, Propaganda and Error	31
CHAPTER VII	The Training of Teachers	43

FOREWORD

The Council of Europe, working through the Committee for General and Technical Education of the Council for Cultural Co-operation, has in recent years become increasingly interested in the field of curriculum development. One manifestation of this interest is the continuing support it has given to what has become known as the OCESCE Study (Oxford/Council Study for the Evaluation of the Curriculum and Examinations) of which this present study of history forms part. Of course, the Study represents no more than the opinions of those specialists engaged in it : any judgements made are theirs, and do not commit the responsibility of the Council of Europe in any way. At the same time, as the one appointed to direct the Study, I should like to express gratitude to the Council of Europe for the help and encouragement it continues, through its Secretariat, to give us.

The OCESCE Study, which is carried out at Oxford in the University Department of Educational Studies, aims at being European - rather than national-oriented - and is concerned with the aims and objectives, the programme content, teaching methods, evaluation and assessment, and future trends in the development of curricula for the gifted at the upper academic secondary level. Through a study of the official and semi-official publications of the member countries of the Council of Europe, it has arrived at an overall evaluation which represents the state of a number of subjects about the beginning of the new decade. It shows a clear tendency towards increasing rigour in the delimitation of curriculum goals, the subject matter taught and in the use of assessment techniques.

From the Study is emerging valuable data concerning curriculum theory in the member countries, which should be useful in arriving at pedagogical agreements on equivalences between the various European countries. To some extent, this is a function of what might be termed the congruence problem : How far do terminal school courses in one country "fit" with initial courses in higher education in another ? What the Study seeks to provide is the raw material upon which pedagogical decisions made by educational experts at international conferences could be based.

The present study in history highlights the common pre-occupations of those who are responsible in the various member countries of the Council of Europe for the planning of history programmes. There is concern for the content of the history course : to what extent should it be nationally or internationally-oriented ; how far should local history be treated ; should the emphasis be placed, in the concluding years of secondary education, on what might be broadly termed contemporary history ? At the same time, the supreme problem of teaching method remains the avoidance of 'prejudice, propaganda and error'. At a time when interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity are terms much in vogue, the author of the study considers what is the relationship of history to other subjects in the curriculum and what elements of history might be integrated into hybrid disciplines such as social studies. The concluding chapter, on the training of teachers, is especially valuable at a time when the whole question of teacher education is under review.

As Director of the OCESCE Study, I should like to express my personal thanks to Mr. Hales for undertaking this study : as the former Staff Inspector for History in the Department of Education and Science, he was responsible for the oversight of the teaching of history in England and Wales. More important, perhaps, in the present context is his wide international experience, particularly within the European framework.

A complete list of works already published in the OCESCE series of curriculum studies is given at the end of this study. They are published in French and English. Further studies in the press deal with geography and social and civic education. They complete the Study of the main subjects of the academic secondary curriculum. A synthesis of the whole series of subject studies will then be made in order to examine such questions as the overall balance of the curriculum, the general trends of curriculum development in the 1970's and related issues.

Comparative Education Section
OXFORD

W.D. HALLS
Director of the OCESCE Study

CHAPTER I

AUTHOR'S NOTE ON SOURCES FOR THIS STUDY

For the views expressed in these pages I must accept personal responsibility ; in particular I should make it clear that, although they are often based upon information sent by the various European education ministries, the information supplied was not official. Nor were the views expressed by delegates from the various countries at the Council of Europe's conferences on the teaching of history, upon which I have drawn extensively.

My first personal participation in the work of the Council of Europe in the field of history teaching came in 1957, when I led the United Kingdom delegation to the conference on the revision of history textbooks held at Scheveningen, in Holland ; the history textbooks we considered were those dealing with the period 1789 to 1871 ; at a conference in Istanbul in the following year, we considered those dealing with the period 1871 to 1950. Four previous conferences had considered the books covering earlier centuries and "the European idea in the Teaching of History"; in each case reports on representative textbooks from each country had been obtained in advance.

The recommendations of these six conferences were published by E. Bruley and E.H. Dance in their booklet "A History of Europe ?" , Leyden, 1960, while Mr. Dance who had participated in all the conferences drew on his experience of them in subsequent publications, in particular in his "History the Betrayer", Hutchinson, 1960, and in his essay on "Bias in History Teaching and Textbooks" in the Council of Europe's "History Teaching and History Textbook Revision", Strasbourg, 1967.

The principal aim of the six conferences 1953 - 1958 was the improvement of history textbooks by helping to eliminate error and prejudice ; but they were not the only, nor even the first conferences with this objective organised after the conclusion of the Second World War. UNESCO, for example, held a conference at Brussels in 1950 with a similar purpose, while the Scandinavian countries had been in the habit of meeting as early as the nineteen-thirties to compare their textbooks. Some idea of the range and number of the multilateral and bilateral meetings and projects of this kind undertaken in the period 1945 to 1965 may be gathered from the list published as Appendix I to the Council of Europe's "History Teaching and History Textbook Revision". Those of us concerned with this aspect of the movement for education for world understanding found ourselves working under a number of different banners - UNESCO, Western European Union, Carnegie. But it would be fair to say that the history textbooks of the countries of Western Europe received their fullest consideration at the multilateral textbook conferences organized by the Council of Europe between 1953 and 1958.

If the quality of the textbooks was to be improved in the future, and at least the grosser manifestations of ignorance and prejudice avoided, there was clearly a need to establish an international centre of information and guidance to which authors could submit their manuscripts, or make enquiries about specific problems, or where they could consult the textbooks of other countries, and it was in these same years - the nineteen-fifties - that such a centre developed at Brunswick [1], inspired by the indefatigable Professor Georg Eckert. It has since become the leading centre in the world for service of this kind and has built up the best international textbook library.

---

1. The Internationales Schulbuchinstitut, Rebenring 33 Braunschweig, Federal Republic of Germany.

It was in 1965, the year when the Council of Europe formally invited the Brunswick Institute to assume the role of a "European Centre for the Improvement of History and Geography Textbooks", that the Council broadened its consideration of the teaching of history by holding a conference at Elsinore on matters much wider than the textbook. At this conference which I attended as leader of the United Kingdom delegation, we considered the whole range of the history teacher's problems - what should be his aims, and consequently, syllabus and his methods ; the way he should be trained and the kind of examining in the subject which is appropriate. The recommendations of this conference[1], together with the national reports and other background papers that preceded it, were considered by Mr. Dance in his book for the Council of Europe "The Place of History in Secondary Teaching",Harrap, 1970. But already, by the time that book appeared, a further conference on a more limited aspect of the same subject, namely history teaching during the years of compulsory secondary schooling, i.e. with pupils aged 11 to 15 approximately, (sometimes called " lower secondary " pupils) had been held at Brunswick in September 1969, a conference at which I acted as rapporteur[2]. Finally, in December 1971, I was invited by Dr. Halls of the Oxford University Department of Educational Studies to attend a third conference on secondary history teaching, which he organised on behalf of the Council, at Strasbourg, and where the delegates from the different countries gave their attention mainly to the last years of the secondary course, i.e. to the work undertaken by pupils aged 16 to 18 and leading to the Baccalauréat, Abitur, Advanced Level certificate, or similar examination.

I have thought it right to explain this association that I have had with the work of the Council, both in its examination of history textbooks and in its three conferences on the problems of the secondary school history teacher, because it is to those European inspectors and teachers who participated in this work that I am chiefly indebted for such information as I have about the purpose and practice of teachers in the different countries today. Although much of my professional life has been spent in history classrooms all over England, I have only been able on occasion to visit classrooms abroad ; so my information is inevitably mostly second hand, but, I think, "good second hand", since it comes from critics well qualified both to teach and to observe in their different countries.

---

1. Official Report, Council of Europe document EGT/Stage (66) XVII 2.

2. Official Report, document CCC/EGT (69) 37.

CHAPTER II

THE UNCERTAIN STATUS AND PROSPECTS OF HISTORY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS TODAY

It is perhaps not surprising but it is certainly very conspicuous that a wide divergence exists between the beliefs of historians in the value of their subject and the doubts about its value felt by other sorts of people. Those concerned with teaching history, or with inspecting history, or with the planning of syllabuses for the subject in secondary schools appear, in all European countries, to be unanimous in their conviction that the subject is not only uniquely valuable but absolutely necessary both to the individual adolescent and to the society to which he belongs. From the statements submitted in advance by the participants in the Council of Europe's conference on secondary history at Brunswick, in 1969, the unanimous conviction emerges that the study of history is the way to human wisdom and the purpose of teaching it is to achieve a just, enlightened and peaceful world. It is described as enabling pupils to "understand the human situation", "appreciate the problems of humanity", "see the relative importance of things", and "exercise judgment". It teaches "the deep roots of our present culture", "stimulates love and respect for mankind", "shows the relations between the natural environment and human life". It "accustoms the pupil to the notion of change in human affairs and so equips him for life" and it "explains to him the present by reference to the past", providing "a necessary background for the study of current affairs and a basis for international understanding". And, perhaps most conclusively, "History teaching aims to help the young person attain his own idea of the world and humanity and to recognise his own position and his tasks in events".

These claims are representative of those made not merely in some of the "statements of aims" submitted by the participating countries but in all of them. And the point which seems worthy of note is not that those concerned with the teaching of history set this high value upon what they are doing -- it would be odd, indeed wrong, if they did not -- but that they regard this subject as the principal, if not the only, means by which the adolescent grows to understand, to find his place in, and ultimately to influence his country and achieve a better world.

When the conference finally assembled and came to pass its own resolutions, it declared roundly :

1. that the teaching of history provides the common basis for all the human sciences ;
2. that the teaching of history is necessary so that the pupil may understand the human condition and the situation in which man finds himself in the world of today.

If others felt the same confidence, we might see history occupying a basic position in the curriculum of all secondary schools in all countries, a position comparable to that once occupied by the classics, and providing a unifying influence on the curriculum as a whole. There would be logic in this, for everything exists in time, and should be seen in its evolutionary aspect ; as G. M. Trevelyan said, history is not really a subject but the house in which all subjects dwell. Moreover, educationalists are acutely aware of the need for some unifying influence today as the number of subjects grows and the relation between them is obscured. But the hard fact is that historians, in the different countries, have nowhere succeeded in persuading those who plan the secondary curricula of this peculiar importance of their subject. Rather have they found themselves fighting a defensive battle to retain History on the time-table, with the modest allowance of about 90 minutes a week for those of compulsory school age and rather more for those in the age-group 15 to 18 who are taking it for terminal examinations.

Most countries continue to require schools to teach the subject to all pupils of compulsory school

age (i.e. "lower secondary pupils") ; but time allowances have tended to diminish, and in some countries, notably England and Scotland, it is increasingly common to find that history is dropped by pupils reaching the age 13 or 14. In a bare majority of European countries, the subject is still compulsory for all "upper secondary" pupils ; but the tendency is towards making it optional, at least for the pupils taking technical or scientific courses, while in some countries only very recent historical material, incorporated into a course in economics, sociology, or current affairs finds consideration in the terminal year. It is evident that the demands of mathematics, the sciences, and an elementary technology -- all highly important in this "scientific age" -- and of modern languages -- so obviously necessary in these days of European integration and of world interdependence -- have put the pressure on history and geography whose "usefulness", in the narrower sense, is less self-evident. Moreover, the claims of historians that their subject fulfills better than any other the vital purpose of enabling the pupil to understand the society he is entering -- a claim always challenged by the geographers -- is now challenged by the economists, who have made rapid strides in upper secondary education, especially in England and Scandinavia, and by the sociologists who have made conspicuous headway in Swedish schools. At a lower level, it is now commonly supposed that some form of Civics, which may embrace recent history, governmental and non-governmental institutions, elementary economics, or a simple form of sociology, can provide a better introduction to the contemporary world than can history taken by itself ; and in the several countries -- France, Germany, Sweden -- History and Civics are both taught, the latter having been included with, and taking part of the time previously enjoyed by the former, in the hope that it will lead the young citizen to a keener appreciation of democratic values and a better understanding of how central and local government is carried on. In other words, while national ministries of education, and others concerned with drawing up curricula, do not deny the need to introduce pupils to public affairs -- political, social or economic -- they are not satisfied that this introduction is necessarily best achieved in the history classroom, and they are inclined to restrict rather than to enlarge the time spent on specifically historical studies.

To some extent, the challenge of these newer subjects to history is more apparent than real. Civics, for example, is often taught by the history master, who shows how modern institutions have grown into their present form ; current affairs similarly, is commonly entrusted to him, and gives him his chance to show how historical forces have created contemporary tensions -- the present situation in the Eastern Mediterranean, or in Northern Ireland will provide him with obvious examples. But, although the historical element is still usually conspicuous in the various combinations that go to make the social studies, the traditional far-reaching claims of the historians, though they found renewed expression amongst the delegates of the Council of Europe's historical conferences, find less general favour than they did. A survey conducted in Sweden has shown that employers give a low rating to scholastic achievement in history when they are selecting their employees. The English report on "Young School Leavers" showed that pupils who left school at the earliest possible moment generally considered they had gained little from their history courses, which seemed to them irrelevant, besides being less enjoyable then the creative arts -- music, painting or drama.

There is a strong pull today, not only towards science but towards those social sciences like economics and sociology which appear to be able to establish laws that give firm guidance for the future. The popularity of historical films, of historical dramas on television, of historical novels, and of historical biographies -- both the edifying and the scandalous -- is conceded ; but there is a feeling that these are adult tastes and that there is no particular connection between "continuing" or "permanent" education of this kind and the sort of courses in history that pupils have pursued at school. Indeed, the fact that history is so evidently a very popular subject amongst adults, and also a popular choice by undergraduates, while it is less popular at school, tends to reinforce the impression that the subject, being concerned with adult behaviour, requires some adult, or at least adolescent experience to make it meaningful.

We must accept, then, that the wider claims made by the historians are not reflected by the status given to their subject in any of the European countries ; accept, too, that other approaches are being employed, as well as history, to achieve that introduction of pupils to public affairs which everybody recognises as so important. Yet everyone agrees that some training in history is indispensable. In all the countries of Europe, a history course of several years' duration is compulsory, except in England (where no subject except religion is compulsory) and in England the subject is in fact taught in every recognised efficient school. It is hard to believe that, whatever the pressures on the modern curriculum, the time devoted to history will be reduced much further, still less withdrawn, because history deals with one of the dimensions -- time -- in which everything exists. Without some appreciation of the sequence of the civilisations, the centuries, the generations, or of the way the peoples and their institutions have emerged, we should be deprived of any same view of our neighbourhood, our country, our world, or any of the human institutions whose life we share. It is this development of the sense of time that is essential, not the inculcation of any particular tradition ; indeed there may be some danger, as was eloquently argued at the Strasbourg conference in December 1971, lest the teaching of one particular historical tradition, intended to be "finally accepted", deaden the senses and stifle initiative. But history conceived as an exploration in time, as enquiry, as the weighing of evidence, as the testing ground of dogmas, or of so-called economic and sociological "Laws", can only lead to a more intelligent awareness, a healthy scepticism, and the humility without which understanding is impossible.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY SYLLABUS TODAY

History as a thinking, not merely a learning subject ; history as exploration and enquiry ; history as a weighing of the evidence on both sides -- to all this we must come in the next chapter when we consider the change that is coming over the methods of European history teaching. In this chapter, we are concerned only with the subject matter or content of the syllabus, i.e. with the centuries usually covered and the parts of the world that receive attention.

Twentieth Century History

It follows from the historian's claim to give his pupils an introduction to the world to which they belong that he has had to bring his syllabus up to date, for it is hardly possible to pretend that syllabuses which stop at 1815 or 1870 or 1914, or even 1939 introduce the young to the Europe of today. All the major countries of continental Europe have undergone fundamental changes of constitution since the Second World War, and the whole continent, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, has since then been grouped together in new political and economic associations. So history syllabuses that followed the traditional practices of coming up to a concluding date some fifty years past evidently left the field wide open to the sociologist, economist, or teacher of civics and current affairs who could demonstrate irrefutably that he, rather than the historian, dealt with what was relevant. History had to be brought up to date if it were to survive in an age that demanded relevance in its education.

But those who shaped the history syllabus were not always quick to make the change. There was an older tradition, derived originally from the teaching of the classics, that the business of history lay with earlier civilisations, or at least with generations sufficiently remote to be considered in quiet detachment from the passions of the present. History, it was said, was about past politics, not present politics ; if it became involved with the latter, it would become contaminated and lose that clear, detached perspective and impartial objectivity that were its greatest pride. It was an argument that did honour to both sides, and as late as the early nineteen-sixties it was still to be heard raging across the floors of international conferences of historians, with the French usually defending the traditional position that history was about the past, and the Swedes prominent among those who claimed it must embrace the present, or yield school time to the sociologist.

But today, ten years later, the argument is over, in principle, if not always in practice. It is conceded that the syllabus must run up to the present day. In France, where for reasons of the highest principle, it had hitherto run to 1870, by the time of the Council of Europe's Brunswick conference in 1969, the classes terminales (18 year-olds) were studying "the contemporary world -- events from 1914 to our own day, and the contemporary civilisations of the world : the Western world, the Communist world, the Moslem world, and the Far East". It is true that those (the majority) leaving school after the premier cycle at the age of 15 to 16, were still not penetrating beyond the year 1870 ; but by a further change they too are now introduced to the major events of the twentieth century, as are all pupils of compulsory school age in Germany and Italy and usually -- but not yet quite universally -- those in the smaller countries. In England and Wales, over the last dozen years, papers covering twentieth century history have been provided in the certificate examinations. But, since in England all schools are free to make their own syllabuses and to choose their own period for examination, they do not need to take papers on the twentieth century, and in practice they still very commonly prefer papers on earlier periods ; on the other hand, it has become usual to introduce all pupils to twentieth century developments at some stage in the secondary course, as is likewise done in Scotland, Northern Ireland, and the Irish Republic.

World History

The extension of the period studied right up to the present day is arguably the most important change that the history syllabus has undergone since the Second World War. But it is also a change of period that has carried with it a change in the character of the subject matter studied. This is because it is evidently impossible to make any sense of the history of the years between 1939 and 1970 except on an international basis. Twentieth century history has necessarily meant world history. When the participants in the Strasbourg conference of 1971 made it their first recommendation "that, in the preparation of history syllabuses for the upper secondary school, the planners' starting point should be contemporary problems and the history of Europe should be viewed in a world perspective" they made two points, but the second followed necessarily from the first. For good or ill (and we must recognise how largely it is the result of two world wars), the twentieth century world is one world, in the sense that science and invention and economics have broken down the old frontiers, even though new ones have been erected elsewhere. It is not merely parochial, but unrealistic to teach the history of the twentieth century in the national terms that may still serve for the eighteenth and much of the nineteenth. The saying that "When Wall Street sneezes all the world catches cold" expresses one aspect of our new economic interdependence. The way in which the whole world held its breath when Kennedy and Kruschev confronted each other over Cuba demonstrates another. Cheap charter flights are a happier aspect of the same inter-relationship.

There are further and special reasons why European history in the twentieth century particularly needs to be considered on a wider basis than the merely national, for the European countries, having shared the horrors of 1914 - 1918 and 1939 - 1945, have mostly since shared in the new experience of trying to build a new Europe under the terms of the Treaty of Rome. It would have been surprising, indeed, if this new international initiative had not already found an important place in the syllabuses of the participating countries and were not beginning to find a place in those of the countries now contemplating entry into the European Community.

If then, we find -- as we do -- in the history syllabuses of all European countries an increasing tendency to shift the perspective so as to embrace more of world history, more of European history, and less of national history, we may attribute the change not merely to the efforts of idealists who hope to "make the younger generation less preoccupied than their parents with national pride, and so uproot the seeds of jingoism and bring about the brotherhood of man", but rather to a realistic appreciation of the nature of the twentieth century situation, which is one where, in Professor Barraclough's phrase, the nation state, taken in isolation, has ceased to be an "intelligible field" for study. Although this change of perspective has been made necessary by the nature of twentieth century history, it has necessarily changed teachers' attitudes towards earlier centuries as well, since it has focussed attention upon the need to know more about other peoples, and therefore to understand more of their background, so that, for example, the Russia of Peter the Great, or the America of the Founding Fathers, have acquired a new significance for Scandinavian, Germanic, or Mediterranean people alike.

How considerable, in practice, has this shift away from a merely national history been ?

The short answer is that, so far as the decades since the Second World War are concerned, there has been a general change, in all countries ; the main themes tackled, such as the movement towards European integration, racial conflicts, decolonialisation, or the Cold War between East and West are no longer national themes. This is not to say, of course, that the French do not give some special attention to de Gaulle and his Fifth Republic, or the Germans and Italians to their own new republican constitutions ; but the setting of the whole is unmistakeably international. With earlier periods of history, the change has been not much more than some shift of emphasis : a greater readiness to recognise the main movements in European history, such as feudalism, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, romantic nationalism, or imperial adventure as European rather

than national phenomena ; a better appreciation of this same truth about the various developments in European art, architecture, literature, and music ; or again a greater willingness to give at least some attention to extra-European societies, whether in Asia or America, in Africa or Australia, at the expense of the less consequential aspects of domestic history.

On the whole, this change of emphasis has been more marked in the smaller European countries than in the larger, perhaps because they have become more acutely aware of the extent to which their security is dependent upon international understanding. For example, the Strasbourg conference of 1971 was told that the proportion of available time devoted to national history in Norwegian schools was now one third only, the rest being devoted to European or World history ; and the Norwegian delegate argued that even this proportion was too high ; only a fifth of the time, he said, should be devoted to national history. The Swedish delegate said that the history of his country, before the French Revolution, had become merged in a general course on Scandinavian history ; special studies were made of the England of Queen Elizabeth I and the France of Louis XIV. The Swiss delegate spoke of the realisation in his country that history today can only be taught in a "universal, polycentric, and global framework".

But in France, Italy and Germany the emphasis tends to be put a little differently ; the need for greater attention to both Europe and the world is well appreciated, but the core of the syllabus is commonly described as French, Italian or German history "in a European or world setting". While twentieth century history -- as the new French syllabus for the "classes terminales" well illustrates - embodies a genuinely world approach, eighteenth and nineteenth century history still tends to look outwards from the national centre. We may see this in the dates which divide the French periods studied -- 1715, 1789, 1848, 1870, 1914, all of them dates highly significant in French history. Or we may see it in the predominant attention very naturally given by the German syllabuses to the process of German unification, or by the Italians to their Risorgimento. This seems a reasonable compromise. There is no necessary antithesis between national and European history ; the main currents of European political social and cultural history can very well be illustrated by what was being thought or done in Paris, or in Germany or Italy, provided the proper comparisons are made and analogies drawn. What is more likely to be missed in this national approach to foreign history is the development that lies outside Europe ; how much, for instance, do the French or British children hear of the growth of the United States into the most formidable power on earth during the century and a quarter between her winning independence (a matter well represented in both French and English books) and her vital intervention in Europe during the First World War ? It is a defect of nation-centred international history that world events tend to be seen as they emanated from or reacted upon European capitals. In England, for instance, as we shall have occasion to note later, we are given a treatment of India that is nebulous before the days of the East India Company, vivid in its portrayal of Clive, Warren Hastings, the Mutiny and Gandhi, and vague again once independence has been granted.

British involvement not only in Europe, but in the world as a whole, has been so extensive that it has perhaps been inevitable that our consideration of all extra-national history has been somewhat London centred. We have given closest attention to those with whom Britain has been vitally concerned such as Joan of Arc, Philip II of Spain, Louis XIV, George Washington or Napoleon. But, though some effort has been made to understand the importance of these people to their own countries, the reason for their selection has lain in the challenge they represented to Britain. Certainly we are far from giving fuller or more impartial attention to foreign history, in its own right, than is given today by the other major European countries, and we appear to give rather less than is given by most of the smaller ones, save in one important particular : our certificate examinations, especially at advanced level, provide papers that demand specialised studies of limited periods of European or other foreign history. These require, for those that take them, work of an unusually high standard attainable only on account of the peculiar British habit of expecting abler pupils, during their last two

years of secondary school (age 17 and 18) to study three subjects only ; those who choose History thus enjoy more time for specialised historical work than is enjoyed elsewhere.

Social and Cultural History

Twentieth century history, European history, World history ; no European country has been unaffected by the post-war drive to bring the syllabus up to date, or by the parallel drive to widen its perspective.

It remains to be considered how far the syllabus has been widened in another way, so as to include social and cultural developments at the expense of the traditional attention given to politics and war ; also how far it has been widened to embrace the life of the people as a whole and not merely those at the top.

All the countries bore witness, at each of the conferences, to a swing away from politics, war and diplomacy and towards social and cultural history. Political history is now commonly supposed only to supply the framework for something more important. But difficulties have been experienced in making this change. Thus the effort may be successfully made to give more time to the condition of life amongst the peasants in the age of Louis XIV, or to the art, architecture and literature of his reign, but it is found easier to include these matters than to make room for them by excluding some of the politics and war, with the result that the syllabus has tended to become overcrowded. An interesting attempt has been made in France to meet this problem not so much by excluding political material, as by concentrating the syllabus upon certain limited periods and looking at those periods "in the round" -- embracing the politics, literature, society, trade, industry, agriculture and the rest. The ages of Joan of Arc or Francis I or Louis XIV or Napoleon, treated in this way, are then linked by a merely summary outline. Something of the sort has been tried in England, and given the rather unhappy name of "patch" history ; and something of this may be said to have always existed, in all countries, in the sense that each country tends to emphasise certain periods of special significance, at the expense of others ; thus one would not expect the Italians to pay as much attention to the eighteenth century as they pay to the Renaissance or to the Risorgimento.

Success in this type of selection depends upon the capacity of the teacher to see that the link between the periods is <u>really</u> only a summary, otherwise, again, there will be overcrowding. A drastic procedure, intended to ensure that non-political topics receive due attention, is to abandon the ordinary political chronology altogether and teach instead selected themes in their development through the centuries. In England, syllabuses of this kind were introduced before the Second World War, as "lines of development" ; they have been adopted today more fully in Sweden than elsewhere, forming in that country the normal shape of the syllabus both in the last year of compulsory education (age 15 to 16) and in the last year of the Gymnasium (age 18), where we find such topics as "Slavery from Ancient Greece to the Southern states of the U.S.A." ; "Industrialisation and living standards in Europe and the developing countries" ; "From Adam Smith to modern economic policy" ; "Social themes in art and literature" ; or "From illiteracy to the educated society". Obviously themes of this kind, considered through the centuries, will give rise to confusion in pupils' minds unless they have acquired some fairly clear conception during the previous years of the sequence of the main epochs of history so that if, for example, they are considering Adam Smith and Free Trade, they know this topic belongs to the period of the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. But, given that rather important proviso, the advantages will be evident.

Finally, while there is unanimous agreement from the different countries about the importance of including more social and economic history, there is less unanimity about the wisdom or practicability of trying to teach cultural history. A difference of emphasis may, for example, be discerned between British attitudes and those general on the continental mainland. In the United Kingdom,

we have some reservations about cultural history. At the Elsinore conference in 1965, a caveat was entered by the Scottish delegation on the difficulty of making cultural history meaningful to secondary pupils, and, although in England the less academic classes often do worthwhile work in studying and illustrating the architecture, costume, or furniture of different ages, the more intellectual approach to cultural history presents some problems. History teachers and textbook writers are not always experienced in the arts, and the rather brief and disconnected attention given to architecture, music, literature, or philosophy when preparing pupils for their selected periods of mainly political history for the university certificate examinations, are seldom amongst the more effective parts of the course. British teachers are also somewhat less inclined to give philosophical labels to periods of history than are their continental brethren. A difference of attitude, deriving from a different approach to history at university, has made those responsible for the secondary syllabus in France, Germany, Italy, Spain and elsewhere on the mainland of Europe more inclined than are the British to use phrases like "The Age of Classicism", or "The Age of the Baroque", or "The Enlightenment", or "Rationalism", all of them abstract concepts, not easily explained to the young, yet appearing in the history syllabuses of pupils of compulsory school age. How far such terms betray a taste for philosophical tabulation that runs right through the teaching as a whole is something one would need to be well acquainted with classroom practice to determine ; certainly it indicates both a leaning towards cultural history and a liking for philosophical concepts which are more characteristic of the Latin countries than of, say, Britain or Scandinavia.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS AND APPROACHES

Investigation and Enquiry

The changes in the History syllabus discussed in the last chapter have been made so as to introduce subject matter more relevant to modern youth, relevant, that is, to their understanding of the world around them. But it is not enough merely to introduce new decades or new topics into the syllabus ; indeed it is dangerous to introduce them unless there is a ruthless pruning of the old content. Moreover, some of the new material is not, of its nature, particularly digestible. Twentieth century history is not easy ; it has not yet "shaken down" into convenient categories. Nor is it easy to look at events on a world level, or to appreciate and explain the economic factors involved. There is a serious danger of confronting the pupil with a multitude of international conferences, or, worse, with a multitude of initial letters -- EEC, OECD, NATO, and the rest. The picture that emerges is apt to be impersonal, grey and confused when compared with the picture of earlier and seemingly more colourful centuries. And while it is right that an effort should be made to interest the young in the United Nations or in the European Economic Community, it is necessary for the teacher to bear in mind that most pupils find it tedious and difficult to learn committee structures or administrative procedures. The older history may have been too naively preoccupied with heroes and villains, wars and revolutions, but it enjoyed some advantages in imaginative appeal. It is no use laying before the pupil information we know to be relevant if that relevance is not known to him and his interest is not aroused.

It was apparent at each of the Council of Europe conferences that this psychological side of the problem was keenly appreciated and had become the object of thought and experiment in most countries. Even at the Elsinore conference (1965), where the emphasis of the resolutions was heavily upon the need for a new content for the syllabus (Contemporary history, World history, European history) rather than upon methods, the delegates nevertheless insisted it was "more important to foster the faculty of understanding and of historical reasoning than to learn a lot of details""and equally important "to encourage and train pupils to use books and other material in order to find the information they need". The conference wanted to see "the use of a wide selection of authentic visual material and of written source material", together with film strips and recordings.

Nevertheless, the reports received before the Brunswick conference of 1969 indicated that reform in teaching methods was only hastening slowly. Invited to state what methods of study were then in use in their different countries, the different ministries of education tended to draw a clear distinction between what was current practice and what was hoped or intended for the future. It was generally conceded that the teacher's lecture and the class textbook still constituted the normal basis of the work. Belgium reported new libraries and audio-visual equipment that were little used as yet because teachers were "too set in their ways" ; Germany reported few History Rooms yet available and little new equipment ; Italy complained that pupils' reasoning and enquiry, required by the new education law of 1963, was not much in evidence ; Scotland spoke of "slavish use of the textbook" ; Sweden reported only a slow change from "teacher confronting class" to pupils working in groups or individually ; Norway said that the basic work was still done from the textbook, with teacher's commentary, question and answer ; Malta said the same. And, although the French and English replies both stressed the amount of experiment in new techniques that was going on, neither country could claim that as yet the basic pattern had generally changed.

It was a feature of this Brunswick conference that it made a serious attempt to explain what it meant by pupils' active participation in their historical studies :"Ex cathedra teaching ... should be abandoned in favour of teaching that will stimulate the effort necessary for research, reflection and expression, based on the handling and study of documents and other teaching material. The teacher will intervene only exceptionally to make the necessary comparisons and summaries ... the choice of method will depend upon the personality of the teacher, the character of the class, the subject under consideration, and the circumstances in which the teaching is conducted".

Amongst the principal demands of the conference were :

1. "Access to documents suitable to the different age levels and prepared by institutions qualified, both academically and by their understanding of education, to supply them."

2. "Pupils' books more selective than the old 'exhaustive' books ... being designed to stimulate the pupil's own activity by means of questions and work plans, paying due attention to accurate historical vocabulary and containing as many historical documents as possible."

3. "Equipment of schools with the materials necessary for teaching history (audio-visual apparatus, maps, etc.) constituting a documentation centre which should eventually include apparatus for reproduction and be organised by specially qualified members of staff."

4. "Study and information centres for teachers on the regional and national level capable of collaborating with international institutions which can furnish materials from other countries."

And with an eye on the impact, today, on young people of the mass media of all kinds, but especially of radio and television, the conference considered it "the duty of teachers of history to teach their pupils to react critically to the outpouring of information."

In short, some attempt at least was made to face the fact that study of World History, European History, and Recent History was not merely a matter of adding something further to be "learnt", but rather a matter of training the pupil to tackle modern problems, to compare different accounts of the same events, to detect propaganda, and so to acquire discernment -- a process equally important, of course, in the study of all periods of history, but particularly needed and particularly difficult where the problems studied are still very much living problems, and arousing public passions.

By the time the Strasbourg conference was held in 1971, the desirability of "activity methods" in history teaching had come to be accepted, in principle, in all the countries represented. It was therefore time to pass on to practical resolutions, including one that the Council of Europe should set up "working parties to devise a series of experimental history syllabuses for the upper secondary school" to be tried out in different countries. And the Council (or alternatively the Brunswick Textbook Institute) was urged to issue a quarterly newsletter making available to teachers "information on the addresses, activities, publications, teaching resources etc. of national and international organisations and institutes whose work had a bearing on the teaching of history."

Two main obstacles emerged at these conferences as impeding the proper development of "activity" or "pupil centred methods" in the teaching of history. One was the natural inclination of teachers to teach as they had been taught, the apathy that makes most of us tend to cling to the known and shrink from the unknown, and inclines the history teacher to "stick to his textbook" ; the

remedy for this must evidently lie in reconsidering our approach to teacher training, which is considered in a later chapter. The other was the shortage of equipment of all kinds. It is evident that in most countries the provision of a History Room, or Rooms, where at least most of the work can be conducted is still exceptional. Yet without such a centre, where a wide range of books -- with several copies of those most needed -- and a generous supply of journals, magazines, photographs and other illustrations, are collected together and properly classified, it is useless to expect to get pupils working in groups on their own, under guidance, on selected topics. And quite apart from the wide range of literature and illustration that needs to be housed in one place, there is the costlier equipment required for radio, film or television which should at least be accessible, even if not available within the History centre. At the root of this problem of supplies lies the need, emphasized repeatedly, to persuade the authorities responsible that the requirements of History, like those of Geography in this matter of educational equipment, are real, and that, although they are different from those of Science, or modern Languages, they are as much deserving.

Enquiring into Local History

It will be clear from what has been said earlier that it is now the normal European practice to study recent history with pupils who are embarking on their last year of school life, whether that age be 14/15 or 17/18, or some year in between. This is evidently logical, not merely because the twentieth century lies at the end of their course in point of chronology, but because it is appropriate that pupils who are soon to enter the wider world be introduced at that stage to problems that are current in this wider world rather than in the world of, say, Louis XIV or Prince Metternich. It has, however, to be remembered that a majority of such pupils will still be very young to tackle problems of this kind, so that it is essential that such matters be presented in a way that is simple, concrete, and makes some appeal to the imagination. It was argued, cogently, by the Italian expert at two of the Council's conferences, Professor Berardi of Turin, that the best way of approach will often lie through local history ; and although his arguments met with a somewhat mixed reception they had the great advantage of compelling serious attention to the essential question of what is and what is not intelligible, meaningful, or attractive to pupils of say 14, 15, or 16 years, who are not amongst the abler pupils, scholastically speaking, but who are certainly the majority.

There was, of course, general agreement that <u>some</u> local history should be included in the syllabus. But it soon became clear that, in most countries (including Italy), local history was usually regarded as something helpful only in the primary school, and at the beginning of the secondary course, with eleven- or twelve-year olds, where it provided boys and girls with excursions and visits they were likely to enjoy, thus giving them a taste for history which, like the sugar coating on the pill, would help them to swallow, later in the course, substances of more serious nutritive or medicinal value. A very different conception of local history was put forward by Professor Berardi, who argued in favour of a much more important place for local history ; and the discussion to which he gave rise revealed important issues of principle underlying the teaching of history in Europe.

Briefly, the Professor's thesis was that there existed a prejudice against local history for older pupils

a) on the grounds that it tended to restrict their horizon to their immediate environment, whereas it ought to be extended outwards to the whole of Europe, or even to the whole of the world ;

b) that it encouraged pupils to develop a merely sentimental affection for the old buildings in their own locality ;

c) that time could not be spared from "more important" history ; and

d) that there were no suitable texts from which pupils could study their own local history in depth and the teacher,often coming from a different part of the country, was unlikely to be informed

on the local history of the neighbourhood in which he happened to find himself teaching.

As against these objections, however, he urged that we consider the advantages ; and of these the first and most important was the advantage the pupil gained by seeing, and by making some simple deductions for himself from what he saw, whether in an ancient church, on a battle-field, on a factory site, or amidst the rubble of the destruction of old quarters and the building of new housing estates. Properly guided, the pupil could acquire the "historian's eye" to perceive the past, whether in the unexpected position of an arch in a building, betraying its different use in a previous age, or in comparing manuscripts or photographs, or noticing street names, or checking the dates of housing developments that will disclose population movements -- e. g. movements from Sicily and Naples to provide the manpower for the new industries of Northern Italy. "Properly guided, the pupil may discover how the inhabitants of his region used to live : how they cooked their food, how they dressed, how they built their houses, etc. . . , and thus acquire a more lively and useful understanding than he will gain from learning political facts by heart or abstract principles. " If the study of history is to be done by observation and deduction, it must necessarily be local history, because it is not practicable to convey pupils for long distances on educational visits.

On this view, the big advantage of local history lies in the fact that it enables pupils to see something for themselves and to make deductions from what they see -- in short, to do something. In however simple a way, they are themselves being trained to be historians, not merely learning about something distant and scarcely imaginable. The question of how much they may or may not know, as a result of their course, does not really arise ; what has happened is that they have acquired a new attitude, begun to see their surroundings in a new dimension, the dimension of time, and acquired some simple skills which they can use wherever they may be, later on, on their travels, in their reading, or when they are watching television programmes. Inevitably, the work tends to lean rather heavily on architecture and the visual arts and in some countries -- most obviously, perhaps, in Italy -- the variety, interest and profusion of what is available is greater than it is in some others. But there is scope too for work with documents, whether with the original, or with photographs. In England, pioneered by the Essex Country Record Office, with its special service to schools, there has been a rapid growth over the past fifteen or twenty years in what is being made available by local Record Offices and by museums for study by school-children as well as by older students. And in all countries it has become the custom for the castle, the palace, the fort, or the battle-field to be supported, near the site, by rooms where the documentary, photographic or other evidence, including any local "finds" is displayed for study.

Those who feel that the main trouble with History in schools is that it is still too commonly a "static" subject, a matter of the pupil sitting and listening and learning, from teacher or textbook, rather than thinking and doing for himself (and all the evidence at the Council's conferences showed that this was a matter of real concern in Europe today) must feel the force of the argument that we ought to be doing more local history with our pupils, or rather getting them to do it. Yet, in fact, as has been mentioned, little is done, save in primary schools and in the first year of secondary education. The explanation of this paradox seems to lie chiefly in the view that an understanding of European and World events in the twentieth century is so important that it is necessary that pupils should learn at secondary school to look abroad and become more internationally minded. The strength and validity of this opinion have already been discussed ; what we have to notice here is that it leads some teachers to the view that pupils should not be encouraged to pay much attention to their own locality, as this will only serve to make them provincially minded and prejudiced. It was all very well in the past -- so the argument runs -- for you to be preoccupied with the background of your own locality ; but today, even if your home and school happen to be at such historic places as Canterbury, or Chartres, Siena, Weimar, Elsinore or Delphi, you must be brought up to give your first attention to the movements emanating from Wall Street or the City, from the Politburo or the Pentagon, from Brussels or Strasbourg. In any case (and this point was made with some force as

against Professor Berardi), it is upon world events that you will be examined for your baccalauréat, or similar exam ; it is hardly reasonable that you should expect to be examined on the history of your own particular locality, which will probably be unknown to your examiners.

The arguments on both sides of this issue are persuasive. Nor should we lose sight of a further point, put forward with vigour by both French and German delegates at Strasbourg, namely that it is not merely the compulsive pressure of recent world events that limits the time available for local history, but the attraction too of the great events and figures of the past especially those that have become part of national and European tradition. Very many boys and girls do want to know something about the names they are always hearing mentioned on television : about Danton and Robespierre ; about the Bastille and the guillotine ; about St Joan of Arc at Orléans, Napoleon at Austerlitz ; or how Bismarck and Cavour united their countries. So their masters and mistresses (and ministries of education) are understandably disinclined to deny them an introduction to these wider events on the European stage for the sake of a local history that may be merely of local significance.

Some compromise on this matter may be possible. On the one hand, those who are determined to stick to the national, the European or the World stage in their setting of historical events are ready enough to agree that it is an excellent thing also to use, so far as possible, local illustration of the national event ; and since all Europe is so soaked in her history, so rich in the treasures of the past as well as in the sites of bloody deeds, it very often is possible to illustrate the event by using its local manifestation.

And similarly, on the opposite side, the determined pursuer of the local study, while sticking to his course in local history, will do well to realise his duty to choose subjects in his field that carry a wider significance. As Professor Berardi told the earlier conference at Brunswick, local history should be the study of a microcosm belonging to a larger whole and one should select those elements of local life in the past which, while coloured by their local character, yet illustrate the historical evolution that has emerged on the wider stage of the nation or the continent. "For the successive stages of civilisation -- e.g. feudalism, the medieval towns, the Reformation, the Enlightenment, the rise of the middle class -- were European phenomena ; but pupils will gain a better idea of these European phenomena by studying examples chosen from their own neighbourhood than by reading textbooks ; looked at in this way, there is no conflict between local history and European history." And again, as he said at Strasbourg :"The local history which can, and should, find a place in secondary education is not a specialised study whose interest lies in patiently collecting and fondly preserving local curiosities, most of them ancient ; nor is it the scientific reconstruction of the evolution of a community which has lived a long time in a restricted and isolated area, an evolution more or less independent of the great flow of general history, and forming a peculiar political, social, economic and cultural organisation ... local history in secondary schools -- and especially with the older pupils -- should be a study in depth, by way of example, of the elements of local life in the past which, while possessing their own peculiar characteristics, are yet a manifestation of the general evolution of history ... consequently the purpose, or better, the purposes of local history are in no way different from those which we assign to general history, and which justify the place of History in the secondary school, namely to show the origin of the present, leading the pupil to discover the concept of social evolution by a progressive study of the transformation of the conditions of human life, in its different elements (economic structure in relation to social structure, political organisation in relation to culture, religion and custom) while at the same time training the pupil's faculty for criticism, accustoming him not to rest content with a single version of events but to consult the documents, the accounts of witnesses, the evidence, and by comparing these to obtain a true perspective of events."

If local history is understood in this way, i.e. as a "manifestation of the general evolution of history", the antithesis between general and local history disappears ; local history simply becomes

a more effective way of studying general history, a way which works by means of concrete example instead of relying on the generalisations of the textbook. But is it really practicable to work in this way ? And in particular, is it practicable to do so when studying the history of the last hundred years, which are so widely accepted now in Europe as the proper period of study for those who are shortly to leave school ? Professor Berardi's reply was that the history of the last hundred years, though necessarily and essentially world history, lends itself peculiarly to local study owing to the greater quantity of local evidence available. For instance, why shouldn't pupils question the older local inhabitants ? By doing this, they will discover what those cataclysmic "world events" really meant in terms of reality ; what trench warfare was really like in the First World War, or the bombing of cities in the Second, or what it was like to live under enemy occupation, or as a member of the Resistance movements. Again, on the economic front, pupils will do well to look at the population and unemployment figures of their own town for the years following 1929 in order to understand why the Wall Street Crash was a world event ; or they can learn a lot by comparing the prices of food, houses, furniture and clothing in each decade, or by tracing the transformation of the railway and road systems. The information available in local papers and magazines for the last century is much greater than anything available for earlier periods, while in the important field of social history that most useful of all evidence, the photograph, dates only from the mid-nineteenth century. Yet it is necessary to add that there is a great need for mass reproduction of all this material, including advertisements, election manifestoes, pamphlets, placards and the like ; the originals can be seen in local record offices or local libraries, but they cannot be used there by the huge numbers attending secondary school today ; it is necessary that they be reproduced photostatically or duplicated in some other way, and in this form they should constitute an important section of the History Library.

The Need for Time Charts

It has been necessary to dwell on this issue of the relation between local history and general history because it demonstrates more clearly than any other the problem confronting every history teacher, namely how to combine the general with the particular, and especially the doing, the enquiring, the investigating with the learning. But it would be unrealistic not to recognise that those who choose to throw the emphasis, with their pupils, on getting them to do, and to enquire, are confronted with serious problems, not only in the matter of the availability of materials but also in the matter of the proper correlation between the particular and the general so that at least some intelligible picture of the whole emerges. And this problem becomes all the more difficult as national history tends to give way to European or World history as the framework for the wider perspective. Thus, if we suppose a French pupil to be studying, in his own locality, the seizure of the land by the peasants in 1789, and the break-up of the feudal land tenure, he will find it easy to bear in mind that he is in the era of that event of which he has heard since infancy, namely the great French Revolution ; whereas, if we suppose him to be looking at unemployment in his locality since 1932 he will not so readily grasp that he is in the era of President Hoover and the Wall Street Crash, or appreciate the connection between Hoover, Wall Street and his own neighbourhood. Very likely he has not heard of Hoover, and his idea of Wall Street is likely to be hazy. Nor will he readily associate those times with the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany; a movement likewise closely related to the Wall Street Crash and unemployment. It is necessary for him to have some general picture of the whole, so that he can place the collapse of prices in America, President Roosevelt's New Deal, Hitler's rise to power, and events in his own locality in the same period. And if, as is increasingly the case, the world framework is also adopted for earlier centuries then the problem for the pupil in "keeping his bearings" becomes all the greater, an we may find him making the era of Louis XIV coterminous with that of Queen Victoria, or the Fashoda Incident with the rise of Fascism.

The problem of providing an outline picture of events, which has to be solved by the teacher of local history and the teacher of world history alike, was less pressing in the days when our histori-

cal perspective was strictly national and we only had to present an orderly procession of kings and queens, with their dates attached, and could expect the pupil of average capacity to be aware (if he were British) what we meant when we said "in the time of the Tudors", or (if French) "The age of Louis XIV". Today matters are very different and much more difficult. We want our pupils not merely to have some picture of the sequence of the main movements in their own country but to be able to make some cross reference from (say) one liberal-revolutionary movement in nineteenth century Europe to another, and (more difficult) to have a notion of parallel developments in Asia, Africa and America.

There was a wide agreement at the Council of Europe conferences that this problem could best be met by making greater use of the time chart, and some interesting examples of different sorts of chart were put on display at Brunswick. One of the most striking, emanating from Spain, made use of the convenient device of superimposing thin sheets of transparent paper, on which had been written or drawn events or buildings of interest to a particular group study, on top of another sheet, which showed in bold black lettering the main periods, or dynasties, or rulers in different parts of the world. On the left hand side of both sheets was entered, vertically, the time scale, marked in decades and centuries -- it is essential of course that this scale should be the same on both sheets. On the bottom sheet, opposite the time scale, parallel vertical columns had been drawn for the main regions of Europe headed : Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, the Italian City States, France, England, etc... Under these headings were entered the principal characters, or events, opposite their correct date -- e.g. opposite 800, in the columns allotted both to France and to the Empire, the Coronation of Charlemagne ; or opposite the year 1498, and in the Spanish column, the Expulsion of the Moors. The advantage of making a clear and firm chart of basic political fact, of this kind, is that there can be superimposed on it a second, transparent sheet, containing events of particular concern to particular pupils who can see at a glance, where, in the general political scheme of things the event that interests them belongs. He may have drawn on his transparent sheet a tiny picture of Chartres cathedral, and, by placing this transparent sheet on top of his basic sheet, notice that the cathedral was built before the Hundred Years War, at about the time of the Third Crusade, in the reign of the French king Philip Augustus, and in the pontificate of Pope Innocent III. The Normans, he will notice, had already been settled in England for more than a hundred years. And, if the basic chart contains any reference to matters religious and cultural, he will see that the cathedral preceded by a little the coming of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, and by rather the longer, the first of the great architects of the early Italian Renaissance, Giotto. And again, if his basic chart has a column for the Byzantine, or for the Turkish Empire, as it should, he will see that the cathedral preceded, by some three centuries, the Fall of Constantinople, and (if the basic chart extends to Asia) that it preceded by more than four centuries the building of the Taj Mahal.

The super-imposition of a transparent chart, with drawings of some of the world's great buildings, on top of the basic chart mainly of political events and personalities, is only one example of many such superimpositions that can be made. It can be equally relevant and interesting to superimpose a transparent chart, on which are entered matters religious, architectural, artistic, literary or musical, on top of a basic chart that is devoted to matters economic, so that the pupil notices for example the economic background to the Reformation or the new prosperity of the eighteenth century that belonged to the Age of Enlightenment. The possibilities of transparent time charts, used in this way, are unlimited ; it is particularly relevant to notice here, on account of the attention that has been given to local history, how useful they can be in setting the local event, or the local building, against its context in the stream of general history.

But transparent charts of the kind described which caught the imagination of delegates at the Brunswick conference, are only one kind of time chart, and not one which appears, as yet, to have been widely adopted, although it seems to deserve more attention from teachers. More usually

one sees the large single sheet, with time scale and parallel columns, on which are entered the main events, under the main countries or continents, with perhaps particular periods ("The Enlightenment", "The Great Depression") blocked in colour. Whatever the pattern adopted, the essentials are that the time scale be mathematical so that each decade or century occupies an exactly equal space, and that the whole be not overcrowded with events. The purpose of the chart is visual -- to accustom the eye of the pupil to the relative position of events and movements, at home and abroad, and this, as we have noticed, is a purpose that becomes more important when the perspective of the syllabus is changed from the nation to Europe, and becomes a necessity when it is extended to the whole world. It is often said, and with reason, that a world history syllabus leads to confusion in the pupil's mind ; that it is impossible to "cover" all the continents. Clearly it is indeed impossible to "cover" them ; but a good chart will be found a wonderful aid at least to keeping the pattern clear, so that those few topics that <u>are</u> selected for study may be seen in their right setting.

One other point about time charts needs to be noticed. It is less helpful to acquire and distribute elaborate and elegant charts to our pupils than to give them the chance to make charts for themselves. This is work that boys and girls enjoy, and they often take the trouble to do it really well. In the doing, they learn more than they will ever learn by merely looking. A pupil who gets interested in making a basic chart, and then perhaps in making a number of transparencies to superimpose onto it, is going to end by acquiring a useful grasp of some of the major historical patterns. And he will find it worthwhile to make such a chart in support of almost any project he may be undertaking. Something was said in the last chapter about what the Swedes call "selected themes in their development through the centuries" and the English "lines of development" -- i.e. such historical topics as "housing through the ages", "costume through the ages", "transport through the ages" ; it is easy to see how greatly the making of a basic time chart, showing the main periods of history in the different countries, and always at hand for reference, will help the pupil to "place" the period to which the house or the costume, the sailing ship or the locomotive belong. It will enable him to draw political, military and economic events together so that, for instance, after discovering that the first military use of railways to transport troops occurred in the American Civil War, he is able to see at a glance when the war was -- i.e. after the Crimean and before the Franco-Prussian war.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATION OF HISTORY TO OTHER SUBJECTS

The activities of both man and society, whether they be intellectual or practical, religious or aesthetic, militant or pacific, all occur in the context of time and in the context of space. Space is the province of geography, time of history. It follows that all school studies should be rooted in the two disciplines.

Reference has been made in the first chapter to the primary importance of history in this connection and to its potential in providing the unifying influence all school curricula have so badly lacked since the decline of the classics. It has also been noted that, in fact, the time allowed for history in all European countries is quite insufficient to enable it to fulfill this function, or to fill all the other lofty functions assigned to it in the manifestoes of ministries of education. Yet, however glaring the contrast between the ideal and the reality, it is no bad thing that we should look at the ideal, if only in passing, and recognise what it would imply, in terms of the place of history in the school curriculum, if it were put into practice. It would mean, for instance, that the study of literature would be conducted against the background of the age which produced it -- classical French literature in the context of seventeenth century France, or romantic literature against the aspirations of the Age of Revolution ; that art would be studied in the context of medieval faith, or of Renaissance human self-confidence, or of the reaction against nineteenth century materialism, as the case might be ; that even science would be seen in terms of what successive ages have been looking for, so that we should understand why the discovery of the solar system, or of the circulation of the blood, or of biological evolution, occurred when they did, or the circumstances that brought about the recent discoveries in atomic physics. It has long been accepted that applied science in the form of invention should be introduced in its historical setting, so that the pupil may understand why the steam engine developed as it did, or electrical energy, or atomic energy ; but the introduction to pure science too is rightly undertaken historically since the primary bond is to discover why men were looking in the particular direction that led them to find what they found -- the laws of gravity, evolution, and the rest.

But if most of the curriculum should, in logic, be approached through history, the reality is very different. The reality consists of some two lessons a week, devoted to a self-contained syllabus, mainly preoccupied with political and economic "out-lines", and seldom impinging upon, or drawing from other subjects. History often is merely that particular pigeon-hole in which the pupil stores what is considered he should know about past political events.

A pessimistic picture ? Certainly, and one that gives no credit for the interesting and enterprising work that is going on in many schools today, some of which has just been described in the past few pages. By their very nature, local history, project work, "pupil discovery" draw heavily on other disciplines, indeed they can scarcely be adequately undertaken by the historian without the help of the mathematician, the art teacher, the geographer and others. In work of this kind we find, today, in most countries, evidence of a fruitful coordination of the different disciplines, so that the whole study is vivified and enriched. Often it is called team-teaching. Where it has been organised, it has nearly always been felt to be richly rewarding -- as it needs to be, since the effort required in the planning and the other difficulties to be overcome when the narrow path of the normal syllabus, leading straight to the public examination, is abandoned, can be considerable.

But, apart from special projects, work that cuts across subject barriers is not yet the daily rule in secondary education in any country, and is not likely to be until a big work has been done in

the field of teacher education. In secondary schools everywhere, subject barriers are still generally high ; so the question we have to ask is what is being done in history to surmount these barriers and relate a pupil's work to his work in other subjects, for its own enrichment and theirs ?

Not very much, if we may judge from the replies sent to the questionnaire issued at the time of the Brunswick conference, save where the teacher takes another subject besides history. If, for instance, the work in history is properly related to the work in geography, this is less because those responsible for the two disciplines have sat down to align their syllabuses (so that classes will study, say, the history of North America at the same time as they study its geography, or the expansion to the West is seen under both aspects at the same time) than because not uncommonly (and almost universally in France) the teacher of history is also the teacher of geography, and so naturally tends to arrange his work so that his pupils are introduced to North America from the one point of view and from the other simultaneously. This, perhaps, is the most natural and simplest form of coordination -- the allocation of more than one subject to a teacher with the same class -- and it reminds one how, in the old days, a form master, who was often a classicist by education was entrusted with a wide range of work with his pupils -- at least all the work in Literature, History and Geography -- and might gain much by his opportunity to coordinate their work as he lost by being no specialist.

It is not only history and geography that are often taught by the same teacher ; so are history and civics, or history and economics, as was demonstrated in the answers to the same questionnaire supplied by England, Scotland, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Italy and Turkey. It would appear that coordination occurs like this in most places where the teaching of civics and economics is now developing, although, in the larger secondary schools, it is becoming less usual for the history teacher to teach economics because there is often sufficient work in the latter subject to occupy the full-time attention of an economics graduate.

To judge from the same series of replies, the coordination that seems most needed is that between history and literature, and history and the visual arts. Evidence was received of efforts being made in Austria to link the work there in history closely with German literature, and from France of increasing attention being given to establishing a closer relationship between historical and literary studies, nor were these isolated instances. But the general picture was one in which little of this kind was yet in evidence except, again, where the work happened to lie in the hands of the same teacher, and this would more commonly be the case in the junior than in the senior classes.

The problem takes one back to what was said earlier on the matter of cultural history. There is a sense in which cultural history is given greater significance on the mainland of Europe than in England, inasmuch as it is more usual there to approach general history itself from a cultural angle (e. g. the "Age of the Baroque") or from a philosophical angle (the "Age of Enlightenment"), and less tendency to relegate culture to short detached sections of the textbook, where it is treated in summary fashion, and as something apart from the main stream of history. But what seems to be often lacking, everywhere, is that use of literature, of painting, and of sculpture as a main source of information about the ideas and aspirations, the beliefs and way of life in the different ages in the kind of way, for instance, in which it was so brilliantly used, for the benefit of English viewers, by Sir Kenneth Clark in his television programme entitled "Civilisation". With the aid of the modern mass media, and the use of the well developed techniques of rearranging literature as drama, it should be possible for history to draw more heavily on the arts, to the enormous advantage of the pupil's imaginative grasp of the past. It has been done, of course, in a number of historical journals, such as the French "Historia" or the English "History Today". It has been done brilliantly by the British Broadcasting Corporation in various historical television programmes, notably "The Wives of Henry VIII", "Elizabeth the First" and "The First World War". But these were planned as publications and programmes for adults ; and secondary pupils often lacked the opportunity or the encouragement

to sample them. Pupil's attention has been drawn rather to more limited "educational" historical films which, whatever their value in illustrating specific topics -- medieval siege warfare, or the treasures of some museum -- make no pretence to the technical development or to the imaginative appeal of the better television programmes or periodicals.

If the association of history with literature and the arts is important in giving human reality to history, it is vital in giving a proper understanding of the literature and arts themselves. To introduce the pupil to Dante without giving him first some understanding of medieval beliefs, or to Racine without the seventeenth century situation in which he wrote, or to Schiller without his romantic and revolutionary background, is to give a poor start to his literary study. In the same way, some appreciation of life at Florence, Venice and Rome, at the time of the Renaissance will help him to understand Italian art, and some knowledge of life at Vienna will help him to appreciate Haydn and Mozart.

But we are concerned with the angle of the student of history rather than that of the student of literature or the arts. The need that the student of history has to imbibe all that he can of the literature and arts of a past age arises from the fact that the arts are the way in which that age expressed itself, giving us its outlook towards life, so that if we ignore them we fail to get properly to grips with it all. To look only at its politics, or even at its politics with a background of economics is insufficient ; we need to have its background of ideas which is too often lacking. For the pupil this is humanising, and enlarging to his imaginative grasp, provided he has plenty of visual illustration, so that he becomes familiar with the shapes and the patterns and the colours of worlds in which earlier generations lived. Our modern techniques of colour reproduction are so good, and their impact is such a powerful potential aid to the history teacher that it is sad indeed if a mistaken economy compels him to employ only antiquated illustration, or sometimes none at all.

Literature and the arts mean human expression. Is there -- the question was often asked at our conferences -- some want of humanity about our contemporary history syllabuses ? If our new World History is to be nothing less than a History of Mankind, do we remember the poet's dictum "the proper study of mankind is man"? Do we not very often prefer deliberately to eschew that moral element which played so enormous a part in the teaching of history up to about the time of the First World War ? Are we in danger, in our modern World History, of moving from diplomatic conference to diplomatic conference, amidst political groupings of nations as artificial and impersonal as the hybrid names their initial letters give them ?

It cannot be said that the Council of Europe's conferences devoted much time or consideration to the moral element in history teaching, which an earlier generation would have regarded as of primary importance. Memories and perhaps prejudices surviving from a time when history was too freely employed and sometimes perverted to provide moral justification for a Great Man or a Great People, for a Race or for a Church make many wince today at the mere mention of morality in the context of history. We dislike moralising and detest moral superiority, and, as historians, we are rightly conscious that different ages have different moral codes and it ill behoves us to pass judgment on the past. Yet the youth of today is nevertheless obsessed with problems that are rightly to be defined as moral, and the more thoughtful of them expect their teachers in the history class to give them a lead about such problems, although they expect too that the teacher shall not be merely monocular but be capable of presenting the case on the other side.

The most significant contribution on the relation of history teaching to education in ethics and morality was made at the Strasbourg conference by one of the Swiss delegates, Mr. Haeberli. In the course of an address which aroused considerable interest, he argued that education in history was important not because (as is often supposed, in these days of student movements) the impulses

of youth need to be checked by a proper respect for past tradition, but rather because the young need to be stimulated into critical thought and to learn the duty incumbent upon them to resist all abuse of authority.

> " As parents and teachers, we have all brought up our children and pupils as yes-men for too long, even when we pretended or honestly believed we had stimulated them to critical thought. Today, we must encourage them to regard all conceivable authorities critically in the manner of Descartes, and us and our teaching most of all. Especially in a discipline such as history, in which subjectivity in choice and presentation of material is inevitable, must the teacher be ready to lay himself open to the criticism of his pupils. Moreover, he must educate the pupil in resistance. Never before in the course of human history has it been possible to exercise power so totally as it is today -- not only in politics, and not only in dictatorships. And so the need to resist manipulation and the abuse of power is more pressing than ever. In Hitler's Germany, citizens disposed towards freedom debated for a long time whether they were entitled to resist their leaders before they organised their resistance. When they finally acted, it was too late. Alongside the home, the church and the state, the school for too long has taught the younger generation to respect existing authorities, even when they were wrong -- in Germany and elsewhere. In democracy, as we understand it, resistance is not only a right which the citizen can claim ; it is a duty. And so the educators of today have the task of promoting the resistance of young people, arousing it if necessary, but never suppressing it. Obviously, resistance must not be confused with aggression ; we must shun the use of force. But resistance is a conscious mental process, accompanied by risk, even when force is not used. Responsible resistance, as exemplified in different ways by Gandhi, Count von Stauffenberg and Martin Luther King, ought to be an aim of all adolescent education, not least of history teaching.
>
> The capacity to resist - in other words 'courage civil' - presupposes education in decisiveness as well as critical thinking. History teaching is in a position to give this in a way that few other subjects can. It is precisely our best pupils who demand personal viewpoints from their teachers in philosophical disputes, such as history teaching offers time and again. Today, it is no longer possible to escape from this demand by pointing to the fetish of so-called objectivity. The historian within the history teacher can satisfy his need for objectivity by always presenting alongside his own conception (arrived at after much difficult deliberation before reaching important decisions) other conceptions which are opposed to his or deviate from it ; he must do so with the same care regarding content, proofs and significance as he employs in presenting his own conviction. Nothing strengthens the pupil's own desire for truth and is so likely to lead him on the path of personal decision-taking as this dialectic. "

The emphasis in this passage is on critical thought, and on resistance. But it is noteworthy that, for all its modern emphasis, we are in fact being brought back here to a point of view commoner in the history teaching of fifty years and more ago, namely to the force of the example of great men, though the great men are now Gandhi, von Stauffenberg and Martin Luther King. The important point is that the appeal is ethical, and is intended to lead to moral action. Thomas Carlyle would have recognised the truth in it. The example set by the heroes of history does matter in history

teaching, even though we should beware of history worship. History provides an essential part of moral education.

Such then are some of the wider implications of the central position to which history aspires in the secondary curriculum. They mean that the subject should have close relations not merely with geography, social studies and economics, which is often being achieved in Europe already, but also with literature the arts, science and religion. But only in a highly coordinated curriculum is such a relationship likely to be achieved. Meanwhile progress seems most likely, and may be most desirable, in the direction of associating history more closely with literature and the arts. Such association is not likely to go very far unless a measure of team-teaching is introduced, different aspects of the life in any particular historical period being handled by a different specialist, not forgetting the musician. But with team-teaching, and with group work amongst the pupils -- both of which are slowly developing -- the tendency towards too narrow a specialisation, from which history, like other subjects, has suffered during this century, may come to be reversed.

CHAPTER VI

PREJUDICE, PROPAGANDA, AND ERROR

The historians gathered together by the Council of Europe found no difficulty in agreeing that only where history is presented without propagandist motive can it serve the lofty aims proposed by its advocates or help the young to understand the present by helping them to understand the past. The pursuit of truth must remain the first objective ; when truth is made to serve some Cause then history acquires sinister qualities, leading to disastrous results, becoming "the most dangerous study the chemistry of the human mind has ever invented. " When captured by a propagandist purpose, the subject that should educate for human understanding, and so for moderation, merely fans the flames of racial, national or religious prejudice, inciting to violence, war, or oppression. By seeming to supply evidence and proof, it reinforces the pupil's incipient notions of superiority leading him, in due course, to oppress the "lesser breeds without the law", whether at home or abroad.

It was an appreciation of this truth that led the occupying powers to burn the Nazi books in Germany after the collapse of Hitler's regime. These history books were held by the Allies to be responsible for having helped to corrupt the minds of German youth and so caused aggression abroad and concentration camps at home. Subsequently, the Council of Europe, brought into being by that movement towards European cooperation which followed the Nazi defeat, gave attention to the problem presented generally in Europe by propagandist history text-books, for it was not supposed that the Nazi books, or those of Fascist Italy, were the only ones guilty of inculcating dangerous attitudes. UNESCO was already looking at the problem from a world standpoint ; the Council of Europe determined to look at the books from the more specialised angle of the way in which they affected the attitudes of member countries towards each other and towards the continent to which they all belonged.

The Textbook Conferences

In the event, six conferences of historical experts from the member countries were held between the years 1953 and 1958, the main purpose of which was to consider the reports of selected readers who had been given the task, in the different countries, of reading history textbooks commonly used in the schools of one of the other countries. On each occasion, a different aspect or period of history was under consideration. Thus at the first conference, which was held at Calw (Germany) in 1953, the attitude of the books towards the "idea of Europe" was specially considered ; at the second, at Oslo in 1954, their handling of the Middle Ages ; At Rome, in 1955, the sixteenth century ; at Royaumont (France), in 1956, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ; at Scheveningen (Netherlands) in 1957 the period 1789 to 1871 ; at Istanbul and Ankara in 1958 the period 1870 to 1950 [1].

The first conference devoted its attention to the "idea of Europe" because this was the idea that was uppermost in the minds of all concerned at Strasbourg in the immediate post-war years. Somehow, it was felt, history teachers and history textbooks had to be weaned away from a mono-

---

1 Some comments on these conferences were published in the books by E. Bruley and E.H. Dance "A History of Europe?" (Sythoff, Leyden, 1960) and "History Teaching and History Textbook Revision" by O-E. Schüddekopf (Council of Europe 1967).

cular national view of events and brought to embrace a European point of view. The European peoples, it was believed, had been much too little conscious of their common cultural heritage, being much too preoccupied with their national rivalries and ambitions, and this has prepared their minds to accept, fatalistically, the wars that devastated the continent. If only Europeans, it was argued, could be brought to understand that the traditions (cultural, religious, economic, political or legal) which they inherited in common were much more important than those that divided them, a basis could be provided for a new kind of historical syllabus that would unite the European countries instead of driving them apart.

But objections were soon raised. It was all very well to complain that Nazi and Fascist history textbooks had made the youth of Germany and Italy myopically nationalistic, and that many of the books used in the other countries were, at best, deplorably insular, but would much be gained by substituting a new prejudice for the old one - Europe, instead of the Nation ? Might this not lead to a new insularity of outlook on the part of Europeans towards Asia, Africa, America ? And again, what was Europe ? It was a continent hard to define, even in geographical terms. If, as came to be widely accepted, it meant the land mass from the Atlantic to the Urals, then political difficulties arose from the fact that much of it lay behind the Iron Curtain and did not accept membership of the Council of Europe or share the same convictions as the majority of Western Europe on such matters as democracy, individual liberty, or the rule of law. If, on the other hand, it represented a cultural point of view, inherited from Greece, Rome, and Christianity, then it was united with America,as part of one "Western Civilisation", as Professor Toynbee used the term.

Delegates were at pains at this, and all the subsequent textbook conferences, to insist that they were not trying to erect a new European loyalty, intended to supplant the older national loyalties, still less to set up Europe, in antithesis to other continents, as the object of a new patriotism. They were concerned rather, in empirical fashion, to draw attention to the fact that the fifteen countries that formed the Council of Europe (and they hoped one day the countries of Eastern Europe would join) owed a great deal to each other in the past and shared a tradition in religion, politics, law, art, architecture, music and the rest that was more important than any individual nation's particular experience and should be given its proper recognition. In claiming this, they were on sound historical ground, and they kept the door open to an enlargement of their concepts whenever a détente with Eastern Europe, or closer cultural relations with the United States, should make it practicable. So, after this first conference at Calw, in 1953, it became clear that the aim was not the creation of a new pan-Europeanism, but rather the overdue correction of the inordinate national bias dominating the history syllabuses of countries which were neighbours and co-heirs of a common civilisation.

This first textbook conference having calmed the fears that the Council of Europe was determined to construct a new historical ideology, the remaining five conferences (1954-58) looked at the way in which the books handled the successive historical epochs from the time of Charlemagne onwards. What they found was that the authors were guilty of few sins of commission but of enormous and heinous sins of omission. National complacency, feeding on pride and ignorance, had led not only the larger countries, but even some of the smaller to picture themselves as the true custodians of civilised values, ever endangered by the ambitions of less enlightened neighbours.

By comparison with this deep-rooted insularity, carrying with it ignorance of other peoples, and so unconsciously producing an absurd distortion of perspective, the particular errors found -- the sins of commission -- sank into insignificance. No doubt there was a balance to be redressed when the English books, for example, accorded the Duke of Wellington exclusive credit for victory at Waterloo, or the French books suggested that Louis XIV had generals who were a match for the Duke of Marlborough, or the Spanish books attributed the defeat of the Armada to the winds, or (more

important) the German books made the foreign encirclement of Germany the cause of the First World War. Such imbalances needed to be corrected and the dramatic events of history to be impartially described. But far more serious was the ignoring of other countries and especially the outer void where vast territories of human experience lay not merely unexplored -- it would be absurd to expect any history syllabus to explore them all -- but lost to sight altogether.

High on the list of those elements in European history ignored by the Western histories, it was found, stood Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire, elements to which the delegates from Greece, Cyprus and Turkey were not slow to draw attention. The point was well taken by the West and well expressed by that doyen of French history teachers, Edouard Bruley :

> " For a thousand years, the Byzantine Empire had a difficult though often glorious existence. It formed a real bridge between Europe and Asia, and preserved a traditional devotion to science and Greek letters, which its influence carried into neighbouring countries and as far afield as the West. As the heir to Rome, its society continued to be governed according to Greco-Roman law. Its economy, which developed within the frame-work of the economy of Europe, was based on a sound monetary system that was often lacking in Western Europe. Finally, for more than a thousand years, it defended Europe against the foreign invader, and its collapse should not obscure its periods of splendour. Without going into the dynastic struggles in detail, Western schoolbooks should give more space to it than the few pages it receives at present. " 1

Even a "few pages" seemed to be more than some countries' books allowed to this legitimate heir to Rome, preoccupied as they were with the less legitimate Holy Roman Empire. But M. Bruley's statement ("for more than a thousand years it defended Europe against the foreign invader") invites our attention to one in particular of those invaders, the Turks. The Turks are tired of being always depicted as a "menace". Their complaint against the text-books of the West is not so much that Turkey is ignored as that it is consistently seen under only one aspect, and that aspect its least attractive.

> " Throughout the whole of medieval and modern history, almost the only mention of Turkey or the Turks in Western textbooks is when they are at war, or threatening war with the West -- during the Crusades, the attacks on Constantinople and the Danube basin, in the Balkans or the Dardanelles.
>
> Consequently, the Turks are always represented as warriors -- usually as warriors committing war atrocities. They have become most familiar in Western histories, in Gladstone's phrase, as the "Terrible Turks", usually with the implication that they were barbaric ..." 2

---

1 "History teaching and history textbook revision" Council of Europe 1967 p. 111.

2 Ibid. pp. 78 - 79.

Again the complaint is a fair one, but again the fault is one of omission rather than of commission. The fact that Christian Europe for centuries did live under, and organise itself to resist, the military threat of the Turks has made it natural that French, Spanish, Austrian or Italian books should pay special attention to that threat ; indeed, they would have been quite false to the politico-religious thinking of the West in those centuries if they had not. But, in the process, Turkish civilisation, and especially that measure of Turkish toleration, and respect for culture and for freedom which made it possible for the important Arab mathematical and scientific thinking to develop under their rule, and which enabled Christianity to survive in the Balkans after the fall of Constantinople, have been lost to view. The Turks committed the double sin of being a menace to the Christian Establishment up until the seventeenth century and hostile, in the nineteenth, to the new religion of liberal-nationalism in the Balkans. Since they also fought on the losing side in the First World War, they have enjoyed a generally poor press in the European books of this century.

The case for Turkey, as for Byzantium, it was found, had gone by default ; and the same might be said for that of the Scandinavian countries, which feel, and make their feeling felt, that their history is unduly neglected in the European books. In their case, however, the neglect was more explicable on the grounds that their influence, save on rare occasions, had been limited ; other small countries, notably Portugal, the Netherlands and Belgium had been more caught up in world events. But it is, nevertheless, a distortion by omission to give the Scandinavian countries attention only at the time of the Viking invasions, or Gustavus Adolphus' intervention in the Thirty Years' War, or Charles XII of Sweden's brief bid for Baltic supremacy ; both the governmental institutions of these countries and their literature demand something more.

If we ask ourselves why there is so little in our books on Scandinavia, almost nothing on Byzantium, and little that is positive on Turkey, we are driven to the conclusion that the reason lies in our intense and continued preoccupation with our own national histories. It is this that causes our sins of omission ; and those sins are to be found not merely in our omission of these and other parts of Europe, but much more in our omission of most of the rest of the world (India, except for British India ; China, except at the time of the Opium War ; the U.S.A., except when she won independence and again in recent decades ; Latin America ; Africa, except at the moments of crisis ; Australia). And further -- and from a European point of view most importantly of all -- it is this national preoccupation which leads the books of all the major European countries to treat the advances of European, indeed of human civilisation, as though they were something peculiarly nurtured and developed by the British, or by the French, or the Germans, the Italians the Spaniards -- with some help, no doubt from outside, but also much hindrance in the shape of war or oppression, for which the foreigner was to blame. It proved to be futile at these textbook conferences to attempt to estimate the comparative extent to which the different nations succumb to this sin of national complacency. There were British assumptions arising from our Whig interpretation of history, leading us into complacency about our prosperity, parliamentary democracy, and sense of fair play ; French assumptions that, after all, when you speak of European civilisation, you really mean Paris ; German assumptions about Teutonic virtues ; Italian assumptions about barbarians north of the Alps. Such assumptions are caricatures of the different national attitudes, but caricatures of attitudes that exist, attitudes that have led us to become so preoccupied with explaining our own national viewpoints to the youth in our schools that they have little opportunity of appreciating any other. So, at each successive crisis, it has been easy to incite popular indignation against another people because the habit has never been formed of looking at matters from another country's point of view. In the Boer War, Europe was quick to assume that the British were uncivilised and brutal ; in the First World War, the propaganda machines had an easy task in persuading their readers that the enemy were savages ; and the Nazi and Fascist régimes found firm ideological foundations, laid in the classroom and ready to hand, on which to erect false gods.

In the face of this national sentiment, so much stronger than any other ideology since the middle of the nineteenth century, and still the dominant motif of the history textbooks, what were the experts called together by the Council of Europe to propose ? Not, as we have seen, a new ideology, the ideology of pan-Europeanism, which was rejected at the first of the textbook conferences. Rather were they concerned to plead that textbook writers should recognise the extent to which all the important experiences of European civilisation -- in politics, religion, economic life, and culture -- were experiences that the countries had shared in common, reacting to them differently and shaping their national institutions differently in consequence, yet all coloured by the same experience.

That this European experience was one experience in the comparative unity of the Middle Ages needed little arguing ; what did need stressing, and was stressed at each successive textbook conference, was that even after the divisive influence of the Reformation and the Nation State had made themselves felt, the different countries, though increasingly separated politically, were all experiencing in common, to a greater or lesser extent, the new movements that arose -- e.g. Capitalism, the culture of the "Baroque", the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, Romanticism, Liberalism, Colonialism, Communism and Fascism. So it was argued that, while each country would doubtless continue to put its own national story in the forefront of the historical picture, much increased attention should be given, even in these later centuries, to the common experience of Europe, and this would serve to show that no country enjoyed an exclusive leadership whether in culture, in politics, in war, in invention or in trade.

The syllabus Conferences at Elsinore (1965) and Brunswick (1969)

At the first of the Council's general conferences on history teaching which was held at Elsinore in 1965, the attempt was made to draw up a list of those major topics that should be looked at as European phenomena rather than as part of national history ; in this syllabus no mention was made of any nation by name. It is worth quoting :

> " Whenever an opportunity arises, teachers ought to show their pupils the European importance of, and the European influence on, the events of national history. In countries where the syllabus tends to be exclusively national, European themes might be dealt with after the completion of the traditional syllabus. In all cases, the teachers' aim should be to stress the importance of these European themes.
>
> As fas as possible, history should be presented from the European point of view. Some elements common to European history, influencing part or all of Europe, are especially suitable for this presentation, for example :
>
> What Europe owes to civilisations past and present, notably Greek, Roman, Byzantine civilisations ; to Judaism, Christianity, Islam, etc.
>
> The Great Migrations, in so far as they concern the history of Europe.
>
> Feudalism.
>
> The Church.
>
> Rural conditions and towns in the Middle Ages.

The Crusades.

Representative Institutions and Legal Principles.

Medieval Thought and Art.

Humanism : the Renaissance.

The Religious Reform Movements.

The Voyages of Discovery and Expansion Overseas.

The Development of Capitalism.

The Rise of Modern States.

Absolute Government and Representative Government.

Classicism and Baroque.

The Age of Enlightenment.

The Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions.

The Revolutions of the 18th and 19th Centuries.

Liberalism and Nationalism.

Socialism.

Intellectual, Artistic, Scientific and Technical Developments in the 19th and 20th Centuries.

European Expansion in the World and the Formation of Colonial Empires.

The Two World Wars.

Democracy, Communism and Fascism.

Europe in the World Today.

Trends towards European Unity in the Different Periods of the History of Europe.

(Attention should be drawn to the place of Byzantine history in medieval civilisation. Byzantine culture should be examined, and common elements of, as well as differences between, Western and Eastern medieval history should be observed).

This enumeration of themes should obviously not be considered exhaustive."

It will be seen from the first paragraph of these recommendations that the Elsinore conference in 1965 assumed that the basis of the history syllabus in each country would still remain its own national history, and that, in some countries, this history would continue to be handled as an exclusively national story, the wider European aspects of the different movements listed being considered separately, as a sort of supplement to the regular syllabus. But many members felt unhappy about this latter arrangement ; if national movements needed to be seen as part of wider European, or even world movements, then surely they should be put in that wider setting at the time when they were first taught ? -- the Reformation in any one country, for instance, put into relation with Luther and Germany, Calvin and Geneva, and the rest ; or, say, the Risorgimento in Italy seen in relation to

the liberal nationalism that contemporaneously characterised Poland and Germany, Hungary and Bohemia, Belgium and Switzerland, in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars. To leave the wider context to some addendum which might never in fact be reached would be likely to leave pupils fixed in the separate and exclusive national viewpoint they had first been given.

While there were these differences of opinion about how the wider European viewpoint could best be introduced into a pattern of history that remained basically national, and the extent to which the national story should be abandoned for the sake of the European context, it was agreed that this European context ought to be taught. On the other hand, there was not much support for the view that the time had come to abandon the national framework altogether and to put in its place a European or world framework for the whole history syllabus. That a wider framework as logical, and even desirable, in handling twentieth century history was agreed, for the sound historical reasons discussed earlier in this book. It was likewise recognised that a mainly national approach was inappropriate to the Middle Ages, and indeed anachronistic, since bonds and loyalties other than the nation held sway in those centuries. But for the centuries after national self-consciousness and nation-state sovereignty had emerged (and, at least in England, France and Spain, this had happened by the early sixteenth century), the national framework was accepted as the logical one for the teacher, even though he needed to recognise how much the peoples continued to hold in common, and the extent to which they were sharing experiences that were European. For the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries were the centuries of the nation state, and no historical distortion was involved in letting the state hold the centre of the stage provided that the whole stage was kept in view. It was only in the course of the twentieth century that a rearrangement of the centre of the stage was called for.

At the next general syllabus conference (Brunswick, 1969), much was said in the final resolutions about the special merits and proper proportions of local history (a matter we discussed in Chapter IV, of European history, and a World history ; but the only recommendation on the subject of National history read as follows : "National history should not be dissociated from its European and world context ; the study of the social and economic aspects of national and local history provide a good basis for the study of European and world history". Behind this resolution (which might have been more lucidly drafted) lay, in fact, much discussion of the still preponderant tradition of national history, and a general, though tacit acceptance of that preponderance, unwelcome as it was to some of the delegates. Yet the conference was surely being realistic, for national history remains a fact, would be a mistake to allow the aspirations for new kinds of history -- not merely a more cosmopolitan history but the history of Science, the History of Peace Movements, and the like -- to obscure the simple fact that the evolution of its own people still preponderates in the history syllabus of each nation, and continues to do so for reasons that are not unworthy, though naturally viewed with some suspicion by historians gathered together to consider wider views. As delegates were reminded in one of the talks at Brunswick, national history, at however simple a level -- and perhaps most powerfully where it is simplest -- is in fact the medium through which a nation's consciousness of itself and its proper patriotism are nourished. The sense of nationality is the sense of a common national memory ; without that memory you do not have a nation. A people may have natural frontiers, as the Italians did, and yet be slow to form a nation ; or they may have few natural frontiers, like the Poles, and yet show a strong sense of unity. They may have a common language, like the English and Irish, without uniting into a nation, or be divided by language, like the Belgians, and yet form a national unity. Neither race nor religion, though both are important, has proved to be the controlling factor ; even a common government, obeyed over the centuries, may fail to produce a national unity, as Vienna and Constantinople found. Nations are the accidents of history ; but, after they are born, it is in their historical memory that they find their emotional sustenance, their patriotism. It is a memory, most

often, of a time of struggle, a time when they were united by a common hatred of some alien oppressor, a time to which they later looked back as their heroic age, and the memory of which they keep alive in their history books. This is not propaganda ; it is respect for the time when the nation emerged. It is natural that young people in modern Greece should respond to the story of how their nation was formed in its struggle with the Turks, or young Italians to the story of their struggle with the Austrians ; and so it is with all the struggles out of which the modern nations were born -- the Dutch against the Spanish, the French under Joan of Arc against the English, the Americans, the Irish, the Indians against the English, and so on. Of course, these epics have lost nothing with the telling ; the account of events has often become highly coloured. But the basic truth remains, and it is not altered by discovering that the Founding Fathers in America were really very human, or that the response of most Italians to their Risorgimento was lukewarm. It is still the case that the American nation was born in the American Revolution, the Italian nation in the Risorgimento, the Dutch under William the Silent, and so on ; any national system of education must therefore, in its approach to history, be expected to give some prominence to these episodes ; if it did not the sense of national solidarity which gives self-confidence to a people would be weakened.

So long then, as Europe remains a "Europe des patries", we must expect the patriotic element in her history teaching to remain central, however much attention may be turned -- and should be turned -- towards those "European elements" that are common to all the countries, and however zealous we are -- and should be -- to see that nations do not falsify history by arrogating to themselves an exclusive primacy in government, or law, or scientific discovery, or industrial invention, or artistic excellence, or martial valour, which does not properly belong to any one of them. And we must also expect that the emotional appeal, and therefore the effective impact of such national studies, will remain greater (especially with that majority who are not continuing their historical studies at university) than that enjoyed by the wider European movements we are now seeking to introduce. National history tends to have a more immediate and personal quality, and to be rather easier to visualise. Besides, much national history consists of conflicts between nations, and the emotion of "wanting your side to win", even to win in history, is strong with the young. It may seem a pity that Anglo-French history, which is so rich in interesting cultural and political comparisons (interesting, that is, to us older students) should still be taught as mainly a story of contests, and probably we should reduce even further the number of drums and trumpets and make more (as the Russians do) of the constitutional contrast between England's 1688 and France's 1789. But we shall not enliven the history class if we deprive it of the thunder of the French cavalry at Agincourt, or of the steadfastness of the British squares at Waterloo.

Our aim, then, must not be to try to transcend national history altogether, but to give it some sense of proportion. If,as the verdict of the textbook conferences indicates, the evil consists in the exclusiveness of our national histories, which gives rise to absurd suppositions about our "unique" national achievements, in every department of life, then the natural way to correct it must consist, first, in making it very clear that much was happening in other countries that was just as important, perhaps more important that what was happening in our own (so that our pupils come to appreciate that their country formed only part of a European flow of civilisation and development) ; and second, on specific quarrels, where they imagine that "we" were altogether in the right, and "they" were altogether in the wrong, we should go out of our way, for a time, to look at the issue solely as "they" looked at it.

National, Religious, and Cultural Prejudice

National prejudice is not the only kind of prejudice apparent in the history textbook. But it is the most prevalent, if only because textbooks have fastened onto the national story, and because, since the powerful growth of romantic nationalism from the early days of the nineteenth century,

feeling has run higher on national than on other issues. Since history textbooks first emerged in the great age of nationalism, it is natural that they first appeared in bold national colours which time has faded little.

One result of these national preoccupations has been, as we have just seen, to develop a national complacency resting on ignorance about the achievements of others. But another has been that we have learnt to assume that it is only politics, or what bears upon politics, that matters. Had there been modern history textbooks in the seventeenth century we can suppose, from the pamphlet literature of the time, that the dominant motif of such books would have been not the nation but religion, with the wickedness (or excellence) of Rome, or Luther, or the Huguenots, or the Jesuits, or the Jansenists, or the Anabaptists as principal subject matter, and few nuances to soften the verdict for or against. We should not have heard much about Germans or Italians as such, though plenty about the Venetians or the men of the Hansa ; and although God's Englishmen, as Milton called them, together with the French and the Dutch, the Spanish and the Portuguese, had already acquired national self-consciousness, the books would have been more concerned about the survival of Christendom.

However, by the time the history book was invented, the Nation and the State had so come to dominate men's minds that even Church history was conceived mainly in political terms, and, although the Christian churches were not ignored in these books, they shared their bias, which was really a political bias. This was the point about Church history that struck most forcibly the members of the Council of Europe's textbook conferences ; they found that what was wrong with the handling of it in the books was not so much Catholic or Protestant prejudice (though there was plenty of this) as a failure to appreciate that the Churches were primarily concerned with religion ; that they were not merely a political force, like other political forces, or only worthy of consideration in political contexts -- an error due to our excessive preoccupation with national and political history. Thus they found that the Church in Germany, after 1870, was looked at only in so far as it was "for" or "against" the cultural unification of the new nation or, in Italy, as for or against the Risorgimento, or in France as for or against the Bourbons, or in the Low Countries as for or against the separation of Belgium from the Netherlands. And, by extension of the same point of view back into the Middle Ages, the Church was generally considered in her relations with the Empire, or with the towns of Nothern Italy in their struggle for independence, or with the barons of England in their struggle with King John. What was lost sight of -- the complaint went up over and over again -- is that churches -- all churches -- are, after all, concerned with Christianity, with teaching it, practising it, spreading it, or defending it, so that their true place in history is distorted if this is ignored and they are made to appear as merely political factors. The immense missionary development of the nineteenth century, for example, or the parallel development of Religious Orders, or the religious meaning of monasticism are scarcely touched on, although the (unexplained) expulsion of the Jesuits regularly appears as part of each political revolution and their return as part of each political restoration.

In this matter of religion two imbalances, it was found, needed to be redressed. First , it should be made clear that, even in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and even when involved in politics, the Christian Churches have been motivated by religious purposes. And second, it should be explained that, throughout European history, and certainly not least in the nineteenth century, men and women have cared intensely, often desperately, about what they conceived to be truth and falsehood in the matter of religion. Particularly is this true of the time of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Edouard Bruley put the matter well in summing up the discussions on the handling by textbooks of the struggles of the Reformation period :

> " Of course, these upheavals were profoundly affected by economic and social conditions -- poverty of the masses, greed of the nobility, desire of the bourgeoisie to get rid of church restrictions on financial transactions, and of sovereigns to rid themselves of Papal

supremacy. Yet the prime cause lay in the fervent faith which still inspired the vast majority and in their ardent desire for salvation. It would be a very grave distortion to ignore or underrate the religious nature of the Protestant Reformation and the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation. To avoid any error in their account of religious doctrines, writers of textbooks on this period should seek the help of specialists from the various churches." *

There is a great deal else besides the history of the Church that becomes distorted or obscured by our national preoccupations. For example, the space and attention given in our books to warfare, though less than it used to be, is still large enough to lead many critics to see it as excessive when compared with the attention given, say, to scientific discovery, which has arguably had an even greater influence on the development of civilisation. Important questions of principle arise here, and idealism is sometimes apt to outstrip historical judgment. It would be ridiculous, for instance, to pretend that wars have not been important, even decisively important in European history. The nations are the product of military struggle, while both Europe and (historically) Christendom, in so far as they are meaningful historical concepts, developed during wars against invaders. The desire that war shall disappear in the future provides no reason for ignoring it in the past. In the same way, it may be that Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Pasteur or Edison have been more "important" to mankind than most of the generals and politicians, but this is not a reason for transforming political and social history into the specialised history of scientific discovery, but rather for paying proper attention to the influence that scientific discovery has had upon our way of life, which is indeed both a legitimate and an important aspect of social history and one to which we ought to give more attention than we do. In so far as we neglect the influence of science, and in so far as we still give too much attention to those wars that were not really consequential, it is largely for the same root reason as causes our other imbalances, namely the depth of our national preoccupations. Wars in Europe have been fought by governments, i.e. by the political organs of the nations (even when they have been called wars of religion), and this had led them to receive more attention than those scientific and cultural developments that have owed little or nothing to the State.

One last example, much discussed at the textbook conferences, of the effect of national preoccupations upon historical perspective deserves mention : the odd way in which the history of other continents than Europe is tackled. Because America and Asia and Africa became the recipients of European national settlements, attention to their history has been limited, for the most part, to the fortunes of those settlements. Nor has European colonisation been seen as a European phenomenon, but rather as the particular experience of the British, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Belgians, or Germans, as the case might be, with a cursory and critical glance at what other countries were doing. It is perhaps in their handling of colonial history that the different nations have shown themselves at their most narrowly monocular, an attitude that has involved them in two serious distortions of perspective, although again it should be noted that the distortion was not deliberate. One has been the tendency to assume that one's own country was indulging in a "beneficial civilising mission", other countries having been merely out for economic exploitation or imperialist adventure. And the other -- more important -- distortion lies in the way that the indigenous inhabitants of those continents, though sometimes the heirs to civilisations of great cultural significance, are seldom treated as though they possessed a history worthy of Western attention until the colonists came. India is a case in point. A great deal has been done lately to present a better rounded picture of the British occupation, but India before the coming of the British and after their departure is seldom taught in British schools. Once again, the problem is not so much one of deliberate or even of unconscious misstate-

* "History Teaching and History Textbook Revision", p. 113.

ment, but of omission, omission of all that is not of national concern. Colonial history is treated by European countries as a part of their national history, with unfortunate consequences for their understanding of the twentieth century world, and with the further consequence that the history of those regions that were never colonised by the European nations and that enjoyed little contact with them -- notably China -- remains hidden in almost total obscurity.

We are left, then, with a picture of a good deal of prejudice, due to ignorance and provincialism rather than to malice ; not much serious error ; and little deliberate propaganda. But some readers of the textbooks, especially those from the Mediterranean countries, would not accept that there is little deliberate propaganda ; they point to the many books with a strongly Marxist slant which the schools are quite free to choose if they wish, and often do choose.

It is difficult to draw the line between what is legitimate and honest historical interpretation and what is rightly described as propaganda. Many countries have powerful Communist parties, aiming at political control, with an interest in influencing the young towards their own way of thinking and a tendency in the classroom that sometimes amounts to a determination to undermine confidence in existing political, religious and social institutions. Where this involves the teacher or the textbook in historical falsification or suppression of the truth, something is obviously being done deserving of similar censure to that which the Nazi or Fascist books have received. On the other hand, it is the peculiarity of Communism that it is a political philosophy that rests upon an interpretation of history and, on the historical side, from Karl Marx onwards, Communist historians have done an important work in drawing attention to the great significance of the economic factor in history and in remedying our serious neglect of it. They have also shown the tendency of certain classes of society -- landed gentry, bourgeoisie, or proletariat -- to act predictably in certain circumstances ; and although their oft-repeated formulae about class warfare, bourgeois revolutions, and the like, seem to most Western historians over-simplified, the assumptions on which their philosophy of history rests are as arguable as the assumptions of the Whig interpretation and very much more arguable than those of Mein Kampf. Many teachers of history, including many of the best, have strong convictions of their own about what is significant and what is not significant in the evolution of history ; what we have a right to expect of them -- and this applies to the Communist, as to the others -- is that they shall not conceal from their pupils the existence of contrary views, and that they shall present these contrary views fairly. It is as important that the Communist book be fair to the national, the clerical, or the cultural leadership, as that the clerical book be fair to the revolutionaries, even when -- especially when -- the mutual hostility has been fierce, as it has been in Spain and Italy, and as it still is. Where this difficult task is being achieved, the special power of history to provide a training in thought and judgment is shown at its best, and the high claims of those who believe in it are justified.

CHAPTER VII

THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS

Mention was made at tne beginning of Chapter IV of a certain note of despondency in the replies received to the request in the 1969 (Brunswick) questionnaire for information as to the progress made by schools in reforming their history teaching. The promoters of the Brunswick Conference particularly wanted to hear whether the recommendations made at the various textbook conferences (1953-1958) and at the Elsinore syllabus conference of 1965 had begun to bear any fruit. Was twentieth century history now being generally taught ? Was there a serious move away from the rigid adherence to the outline textbook and the lecture ? Were pupils being given the chance to find things out for themselves ? Was better equipment being provided, such as audio-visual apparatus, and the liberal supply of books papers and illustrative material to enable them to undertake this sort of work? Were schools being better provided with History Rooms or History Centres ? And had anything been done to correct the more glaring imbalances and prejudices of the textbooks ?

The replies were disappointing. Very little, it seemed, was yet happening about any of these things. In the field of syllabus reform, it was true, matters were on the move ; twentieth century history and more European and World history were being taught. But progress in the other matters, which all involved a change in method and approach, was only slight. To the British, accustomed to expect change to be slow, even preferring it to be slow, because preferring it to be the outcome of a gradual process of argument and persuasion, there seemed nothing surprising or disquieting in the fact that there was little as yet to show for all the conferences that had been held. But, to those coming from countries where ministries of education had it in their power to lay down syllabuses and to assume direct responsibility for the supply of new equipment, it was disappointing that so little had yet changed, except that syllabuses had generally been brought up to a recent date and widened in their perspective. In part, delegates were inclined to blame governments for their parsimony in providing the necessary rooms and equipment (a criticism repeated at Strasbourg in 1971). In part, they were inclined to blame those concerned with publicity, who had failed to make known within member countries what the Council of Europe had been doing and recommending.

But the real obstacle to reform, it was generally agreed, was the failure to introduce teachers to the new ideas and their tendency to continue in the ways to which they were accustomed, having themselves been trained in them. It was therefore felt to be of the greatest importance that both the initial training of the new entrants into the teaching profession, whether at universities or at colleges of education, and the continued training at special courses of those already in teaching employment should serve to introduce teachers to the new attitudes of pupil enquiry, simple "research" and contact with source material.

Improvement in teacher training is not, of course, only required in the field of history. A good deal of attention has recently been given by the Council of Europe to the general problem over the curriculum as a whole, and to that of continued training in particular, which is the subject of two recent studies sponsored by the Committee for General and Technical Education [1]. This is not

---

[1] Continued Training for Teachers by Nils Gunnar Emrich, (1967) and The Further Training of Teachers by Professor Giovanni Gozzer (1972).

the place to go into the wider aspects of the problem ; most readers will be well aware of what is involved in continued training, namely bringing a teacher up to date, whether in recent research in his subject, or in educational theory, or in new skills or technologies, or in the changed attitudes about his relationship with pupils, parents and the outside world generally. The reader will also be aware how particularly relevant this experience of continued education must be to the teacher of history who is seeking to familiarise himself with the developments we have been discussing in this book.

All the Council of Europe's conferences on history devoted some attention to this matter of training the teacher and at the last of them (Strasbourg 1971) Mr. Maitland Stobart, of the Council's staff, summarised past findings and invited recommendations for the future. This resulted in a reaffirmation by the delegates of the demand made at the second conference (Brunswick, 1969) for a symposium to be devoted specifically to teacher training in history ; and it was requested that such a symposium be held as soon as possible.

It was the Brunswick conference that gave most detailed attention to the problem.[2] Starting with the proposition that the teaching of history should be entrusted to specialists in the subject, it urged that their training should be both theoretical -- in college or university -- and practical, in schools. It should embrace the different aspects of history -- social, economic, etc. -- and related subjects, such as archaeology, or the history of art, thought and literature. It ought to include an introduction to child psychology, group psychology, and teaching methods particularly appropriate to history, which again would mean constant consultation between the staffs of colleges and schools, together with refresher courses and exchanges with foreign countries. Ministries and local authorities would have to ensure that teachers appreciated the importance of history and were kept abreast of developments in the teaching of the subject both at home and abroad.

From this, the Brunswick conference went on to urge the Council of Europe to provide teachers of secondary school pupils with chronological tables of the main movements in European history (similar to that drawn up at Elsinore. See p. 35) together with a list of the principal events of the last two hundred years of that history. These charts were to be large enough to be hung on the wall, and "teachers' guides" were to be provided in explanation of them. The Council was also urged to provide, or cause others to provide lists of documents illustrative of local, national, European and World history and to facilitate the exchange of such documents ; and the Textbook Institue at Brunswick was asked to enlarge the scope of its activities to embrace a register of such material. Similar proposals were made concerning the circulation of information about historical films, and a special plea was made for the production and exchange of films depicting the actual teaching situation as between teachers and pupils when the latter were being introduced to active historical enquiry. The conference regretted that little had yet been done to implement the Committee of Ministers' resolution that member countries should set up national centres of documentation and information ; but it congratulated the Brunswick Institute on the service it was providing.

Such were the developments in the field of teacher training in history outlined by Mr. Stobart at the last of the conferences (Strasbourg, 1971). This conference, in endorsing the previous (Brunswick) demand for a new symposium to be specifically devoted to teacher training in history, added that it would be a good thing to invite to it representatives of the universities as well as of the schools.

---

[2] See pp. 21 - 24 of the Final Report (CCC/EGT (69) 37).

The discussion that followed Mr. Stobart's talk showed that two quite distinct, though not conflicting anxieties were upper-most in the minds of the delegates. On the one hand they wanted teachers of history to be themselves better historians, more widely read, more accustomed to the evaluation of evidence, and better acquainted, in particular, with recent history, all of which implied that there was need for the universities to concern themselves seriously with their training. But, at the same time, delegates were acutely aware that it was not enough that teachers should merely be good historians, and they recollected that the universities were apt to be more interested in producing professional historians than they were in the problems of schools. The problems of pedagogy were as serious as those of scholarship and more often forgotten. Behind all the discussion, one could sense the real concern of many delegates that somehow -- e.g. at the proposed symposium, if that were held -- a serious attempt should be made to grapple with the psychological and human problem of how, at the different age levels of secondary education, a teacher could most effectively guide his pupils towards interesting and rewarding work that the pupils themselves would find both interesting and rewarding. Did the answer lie in training teachers to tackle problems with their pupils, rather than outline periods of history ? ("Study problems, not periods", Lord Acton said). Did it lie in awakening them to the possibilities of local history, family history, photographs, architecture ? The possibilities were legion and there was only time to touch upon a few. Wisely, the conference recommended that the Council of Europe should set up "working parties to devise a series of experimental history syllabuses .... to be tried out in a limited number of schools, in some or all of the member states". Evidence of that kind is much needed ; we still know far too little about what can effectively be done, too little about the different avenues it is most worth while to explore in training our teachers.

But we do know how urgent is the need to find more fruitful methods. And we are not likely to find that need better expressed than it was in the reply received from France to the questionnaire sent out before the Brunswick conference of 1969. In that reply the two most essential requirements in training the history teacher were defined with customary French clarity in words with which it is fitting to conclude this study :

" (1) To train teachers who not only know a great deal of history but above all can assimilate and master what they know, who have a taste for learning and research, and an appreciation of life and of human qualities.

(2) To adapt, for each age-group, the aims and methods of history teaching to the intellectual and psychological capacities of the children : a joint undertaking for teachers and psychologists who are at the same time experienced educationists. "

PUBLICATIONS OF THE COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION

In the same section - General and technical education

EDUCATION IN EUROPE

Primary and secondary Education - Modern Trends and common problems (1963)
Civics and European Education at the Primary and Secondary Level (1963)
Pupil Guidance - Facts and Problems (1964)
Teacher Training (1965)
School Systems - A guide (1965)
Introducing Europe to Senior Pupils (1966)
The Observation and Guidance Period (1967)
History Teaching and History Textbook Revision (1967)
Geography Teaching and the Revision of Geography Textbooks and Atlases (1968)
Examinations - Educational aspects (1968)
The place of History in Secondary Teaching (1968)
The Countries of Europe seen by their Geographer (1970)
The Teaching of Geography at School Level (1970)
School Systems - A guide - Second revised edition (1970)

COMPANION VOLUMES

Books Dealing with Europe - Bibliography for teachers (1965)
Out-of-Class activities and Civic Education (1967)
European Curriculum Studies : N° 1 Mathematics (1968)
N° 2 Latin (1969)
Towards a European Civic Education during the First Phase of Secondary Education (1969)
Catalogue of Audio-Visual Documents for the Training of Teachers (1970)
Reports on Films for the Teaching of Mathematics in Europe (1970)
Technical and Vocational Education : (Six area studies (1970))
Continued Education (1971)
European Curriculum Studies : N° 3 Biology (1972)
N° 4 Chemistry (1972)
N° 5 Mother Tongue (1972)
N° 6 Physics (1972)
N° 7 Economics (1972)

Printed in Belgium

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
CYPRUS
DENMARK
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
FINLAND
FRANCE
GREECE
HOLY SEE
ICELAND
IRELAND
ITALY
LUXEMBOURG
MALTA
NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNITED KINGDOM